

तमसा मा ज्यतिगमय

VISVA BHARATI
LIBRARY
SANTINIKETAN

905

A.B.O.R.I

V.17, 1935-36

150091

Vol. XVII]

[PART I

**Annals of the
Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute, Poona
Volume XVII
1935-36**

EDITED BY

A. B. GAJENDRAGADKAR, M. A.,

Professor of Sanskrit, Elphinstone College, Bombay

AND

V. G. PARANJPE, M. A., LL. B., D. Litt.

Professor of Sanskrit, Fergusson College, Poona.



Printed and published by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, M. A., Ph. D., at the
Bhandarkar Institute Press, Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute, Poona No. 4.

POONA

1935

CONTENTS

VOLUME XVII, PART I

(30-11-35)

ARTICLES	PAGES
1 The Dates on the Smṛti-Chapters of the Matsya-Purāṇa by Rajendra Chandra Hazra, M. A. ...	1-36
2 Kavīdarpaṇam (A Prākṛta Treatise on Metres) by Prof. H. D. Velankar, M. A. ...	37-60
3 Some Observations on the Figures of Speech in the Rgveda by Abel Bergaigne: Translated into English by A. Venkatasubbiah ...	61-83
MISCELLANEA	
4 Methods Adopted by Jaina Writers for recording their own Names and those of their Gurus in the works composed by them by Prof. H. R. Kapadia, M. A. ...	84-86
REVIEWS	
5 Pravacanasāra : [The <i>Pravacinasāra</i> of Kunda-kunda Ācārya together with the commentary <i>Tattvadīpikā</i> by Amṛtacandra Sūri, with English Translation by Barend Faddagōn, Edited with an Introduction by F. W. Thomas, Cambridge, 1935, pp. xxiv + 228, Jaina Literature Society Series Vol. I, Price 15s. net] reviewed by Prof. A. N. Upadhye, M. A. ...	87-92
6 Indo-Aryan Literature and Culture = Origins = by Prof. Nagendranath Ghose, M. A., B. L. of the Dacca University (The Book Company Ltd. Calcutta, 1934) reviewed by S. N. Tadpatrikar, M. A. ...	93-95
7 Festschrift Moriz Winternitz, herausgegeben von Otto Stein und Wilhelm Gampert, 1933, Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig Pp. XLV + 357 reviewed by Dr. S. M. Katre, M. A., Ph. D. ...	96

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

Vol. XVII]

OCTOBER 1935

[PART I

THE DATES OF THE SMṚTI-CHAPTERS OF THE MATSYA-PURĀṆA.

BY

RAJENDRA CHANDRA HAZRA, M. A.

Department of Sanskrit, Dacca University.

The determination of the date of composition of the *Matsya-Purāṇa*, as we have it now, is rather difficult. No one date is sufficient for it, because it has suffered through repeated additions and losses. Hence, for the date of this Purāṇa in its earlier form, we shall have to look to the chapters dealing with the genealogies of kings of the Solar and Lunar dynasties, for, these chapters are undoubtedly the oldest parts in the present *Matsya*. These chapters, again, should be divided into two groups, viz. (1) chapters 11-12, 23-24 and 43-46, which have not yet been traced anywhere else, and (2) chapters 47-50 and 271-273, which greatly resemble chapters 96 (verses 192ff.), 97-98 and 99 (especially, except verses 367-391) of the *Vāyu-Purāṇa*. Besides these, there are also other chapters which are common to the *Matsya* and the *Vāyu-Purāṇa*, viz. *Matsya-Purāṇa* chapters 51, 114, 124-128 and 141-145 and *Vāyu-Purāṇa* chapters 29, 45 (verses 69 to end), 46 (verses 1 to end, except some verses), 50 (verses 56 to end), 51, 52 (verses 1 to 71^a), 52 (71^b to end) and 53. We shall first turn our attention to the chapters of the second group, and especially to chapters 50 (verses 72ff) and 271-273

dealing with the future dynasties, because their date will help us to ascertain the date of the present *Matsya-Purāṇa*.

The striking agreement between the chapters common to the *Matsya* and the *Vāyu-Purāṇa* naturally raises in our mind the question as to whether these two Purāṇas borrowed their accounts from the same original source or one of them copied from the other. As a solution Mr. Pargiter has put forth the theory that about the last quarter of the 3rd century A. D. the *Matsya* borrowed from the *Bhaviṣya* the shorter account (of the future dynasties) which ended with the downfall of the Andhras and the local kingdoms that survived them a while. 'The *Bhaviṣya* account was then extended down to the time when the Gupta kingdom had acquired the territories assigned to it, and its language was revised; that would be (say) about 320-325 A. D. The *Vāyu* copied that extended and revised account from the *Bhaviṣya* almost immediately, and that is the version found in eVāyu (i. e. a Ms of the *Vāyu-P.* preserved in the India Office Library and called eVāyu by Mr. Pargiter for differentiation). Afterwards, the language of the *Bhaviṣya* version was revised again about 330-335..... This second revision was soon adopted by the *Vāyu* and is the version found now in *Vāyu* Mss generally.'¹ This theory, with all its attractiveness and reasonings, is not free from defects. The way, in which the *Matsya* and the *Vāyu* refer to the 'Bhaviṣya',² shows clearly that their versions were not copied verbatim from the original source, for in the 'Bhaviṣya' itself such references would be absurd and meaningless. If so, why, then, do the two versions agree almost literally not only in the genealogies but also in the stories of kings, sages and demons; viz. *Matsya* 47 = *Vāyu* 96 (verses 192ff)—98 (on Viṣṇu's different incarnations and the war between the gods and the demons); *Matsya* 48, 30 - 89 = *Vāyu* 99, 35-98 (containing the story of the birth of Dīrghatamas, his practice of go-dharma and his begetting of five sons on the maid-

1. Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali age*, Introduction p. xiii.

2. Viz: in 'tān sarvān kīrtayiṣyāmi Bhaviṣye kathitān nṛpān'—*Matsya* 50, 75 = *Vāyu* 99, 267; the *Vāyu* reads 'paṭhitān' for 'kathitān'; 'tasyānnavāye vakṣyāmi Bhaviṣye kathitān nṛpān'—*Matsya* 50, 77 = *Vāyu* 99, 270; the *Vāyu* reads 'tāvate' for 'kathitān'. And 'Bhaviṣye te prasamkhyātāḥ purāṇajñaiḥ śrutarṣibhiḥ'—*Matsya* 273, 37 = *Vāyu* 99, 417; the latter reads bhaviṣyais-tatra samkhyātāḥ for 'Bhaviṣye etc'.

servant and the wife of Vali); *Matsya* 49, 15-34 = *Vāyu* 99, 139-158 (story of the birth of Bharadvāja); and so on. The genealogies of kings are given in some other Purāṇas also and there are, of course, certain verses which are found common to two or more of them, but the striking agreement which is found between the *Matsya* and the *Vāyu* is to be met with nowhere else. So the mutually agreeing *Matsya* and *Vāyu* versions, which are not copies made from the original source, could not be based independently upon this source—because in that case they could never agree so literally—but one of them must have drawn upon the other.

The expressions '.....Bhaviṣye kathitān nṛpān,' 'Bhaviṣye te prasamkhyātāḥ.....' etc. occurring both in the *Vāyu* and the *Matsya*, should not be taken to be due to the independent use of the same original (be it the *Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa* or anything else) by these two Purāṇas. But the reason is that, as we shall see below, the version of the *Vāyu* was based on some original to which it refers as '*Bhaviṣya*' and the *Matsya* version is only a copy of the *Vāyu* version. So the references also have been retained in the *Matsya*.

It may be questioned, 'If one of the *Matsya* and the *Vāyu* used the other as the source, then how are we to explain the differences between the two Purāṇas in readings and additional verses?' The answer is that such differences are to be ascribed to the later additions, alterations, losses and mistakes made by the scribes. Even the different Mss of a particular Purāṇa are always found to differ not slightly in readings and numbers of verses, but inspite of such differences the work is originally the same. So, the *Matsya* and *Vāyu* versions should not be taken to be distinct from, and independent of, each other merely on account of such differences. On the other hand, a comparison of readings and verses given from different Mss in the AnSS editions of the *Vāyu* and the *Matsya* lessens such variations to a very great extent. It should be remembered that no one Ms of a Purāṇa is reliable for such comparison, for it is not seldom found that while one Ms preserves a correct reading in a place another makes a mistake and the verses omitted by one Ms in a place are found in another. For example, *Vāyu* 99, 15 (= *Brahmāṇḍa* III, 74, 14 = *Matsya* 48, 11^b-12^a); the *Matsya* reads '*Kolāhalasya*' for '*Kālāhalasya*' of the *Vāyu* and the *Brahmāṇḍa*) was not

found in the Ms C of the *Vāyu* (vide *Vāyu-P.*, p. 370, foot-note); *Vāyu* 99, 17^a (= *Brahmāṇḍa* III, 74, 16^a = *Matsya* 48, 14^b; reading differs) was not found in the Ms B of the same Purāṇa; and so on. Similarly, *Matsya* 49, 52^b-59 (= *Vāyu* 99, 175-182; readings differ) were not found in the Ms C (vide *Matsya-P.*, AnSS ed. p. 102, foot note); and so on. On the other hand *Mat.* 49, 61-69, which are not found in the *Vāyu-P.*, were also not found in the Mss D and E of the *Matsya* (vide *Matsya-P.*, AnSS ed., p. 102, foot-note); *Mat.* 50, 41^b, not occurring in the *Vāyu* did not also occur in the Mss A and B (vide *Matsya-P.*, AnSS ed., p. 105, foot-note); and so on. As regards the readings also a good number of such examples may be given.

As to the inter-relation among the *Vāyu*, *Brahmāṇḍa*, and *Matsya*, it may be said that the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa*, though originally one, were separated long ago. Since separation they have been subjected, separately and independently, to additions, alterations, losses and mistakes made by the scribes. As the same additions, alterations etc. were not, and could not possibly be, made in these two separate works by different hands belonging to different climes and ages, where one is found to preserve the original text and reading, the other makes a mistake. It is only for this reason that, "where the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* differ, one of them not seldom agrees with the *Matsya*" which also has not escaped additions, alterations etc; that "single Mss of them sometimes vary so as to agree with the reading of the *Matsya*;" and that "one Purāṇa occasionally omits a verse which appears in one or both of the two others, yet a single Ms (or a very few Mss) of it has at times preserved that verse....." ¹.

From all that has been said above it follows that the *Matsya* and *Vāyu* versions were not based independently on the same original source nor were they copied verbatim from it, but that either the *Matsya* version was copied from that of the *Vāyu* or vice versa. We shall now try to see which one is the borrower. In *Matsya* 142 (= *Vāyu* 57, 1-85) the genealogies of the sages are referred to as narrated before² but there is no

¹ Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali age*, Introduction, p. vi.

² Cf. *kramāgatam mayāpy-etaṁ tubhyam noktam yuga-dvayam, ṛṣi-vamśa-prasaṅgena vyākulatrāt tathātmanaḥ* — *Matsya* 142, 39 = *Vāyu* 57, 38. The latter reads 'hi' for 'api,' 'proktam' for 'noktam' and 'tathaiva ca' for 'tathātmanaḥ.'

chapter in the *Matsya* dealing with these and preceding chapter 142, whereas in the *Vāyu* there is a chapter (viz. 28) which deals with ṛṣi-varṇa. In the *Matsya* the genealogies of sages are given as late as in chapters 195-202 which, on account of their position and elaborate character, seem to be later additions. Moreover, the opening verses contain Manu's mention of Śiva's curse on the sage—a curse which has really not been referred to by the Fish anywhere in the *Matsya-P.* These chapters (195-202), which practically treat of the gotras and pravara-s, may have been based on the works on pravara-s ascribed to Baudhāyana, Kātyāyana, Viśvāmitra, Garga and others ('pravara-gotratoḥ samānatvāsamānatve Baudhāyana—Kātyāyana—Viśvāmitra—Gargādi-praṇiteṣu pravara-grantheṣu prasiddhe'—Vide *Parāśara-bhāṣya* of Mādhavācārya, Vol. I, part ii. p. 72). Again, in *Matsya* 50, 68-71 (= *Vāyu* 99, 260-263 ; the *Vāyu* differs in readings in several places) the sages, wishing to hear of the future, put to Sūta several questions about (1) the future kings—their names and the periods of their reigns, and (2) the future ages—their characteristic signs, their merits and defects, and the happiness and misery of the people during these ages. Consequently, Sūta, promising to narrate to them the future Kali age, the future manvantaras and the future kingships¹, begins with the future kings and answers all the questions in *Matsya* 50 (verses 77 to end = *Vāyu* 99, 270-280^a) and 271-273 (= *Vāyu* 99, 281 to end). About the future manvantaras, which Sūta himself wants to narrate, nothing is said in the *Matsya-P.*, whereas in the *Vāyu* these are dealt with in the following chapter (viz. chapter 100). From these disagreements between the two Purāṇas it follows that the *Matsya-P.* borrowed only those chapters from the *Vāyu*, which it found necessary, without caring for the lines containing references to other chapters of the *Vāyu*. So, we may hold that the *Matsya* borrowed the chapters common to itself and the *Vāyu* from the latter and not from the *Bhaviṣya*. And this priority of the *Vāyu* account explains why " the *Vāyu* has Prakritisms sometimes where the *Matsya* has correct Sanskrit. " ²

¹ Cf. *Matsya* 50, 72-76 = *Vāyu* 99, 264-269; the readings differ in a few cases.

² Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali age*, Introduction, p. xiv.

The above view is supported further by the *Vāyu* Mss themselves. One *Vāyu* Ms (referred to as *eVāyu* by Mr. Pargiter and belonging to the India Office Library) is described as follows: "Very valuable because it has readings different from the printed editions and some verses not contained therein; and where it differs therefrom, it often agrees with the *Matsya* ' ' Moreover, in that portion of the account, which deals with the evils of the Kali age and a chronological-astronomical summary of the age, "the account in *eVāyu* has the full description with the exception of a few verses." From these it follows that the agreement between the *Vāyu* and *Matsya* versions was once much greater than it is now and that the text of the *Vāyu* has been much tampered with, with the result that it has suffered, not without occasional gain, through additions, losses and mistakes. It should be noted here that the *Vāyu* Ms referred to can not be proved to have preserved the original readings of the *Vāyu* and that there might have been other Mss containing better readings.

Before finishing this topic we are confronted with another problem, viz, why *Vāyu* 99, 365-391, which carry the narrative down to the rise of the Guptas, do not occur in the *Matsya-P.*, though the latter drew upon the former. The explanation is that the *Vāyu* version of the dynasties of the Kali age must have had two stages of termination. In its earlier stage it ended with the downfall of the Andhras and the local kingdoms that survived them a while, and it was in this stage that the *Matsya* copied the *Vāyu* version. In the second stage the *Vāyu* account was extended to the rise of the Guptas by the addition of verses 365-391 of *Vāyu* 99. There being no mention of Samudragupta's conquests in this later addition, Mr. Pargiter thinks, and not unreasonably, that this addition was made not later than 335 A. D.² Hence the date of the *Vāyu* version in its earlier stage should be placed not earlier than the middle of the 3rd century A. D. when the Andhra kingdom fell and not later than 335 A. D., and most probably about the last quarter of the third century

¹ Ibid., Introduction p. xxiii.

² Ibid., Introduction, p. xiii.

A. D. ¹ So, the date of the *Matsya* version also falls either in the last quarter of the 3rd or the first quarter of the 4th century A. D. The occasional crude style of the *Matsya* version and the agreement between the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* as regards the extended portion of the dynastic account need not go against the priority of the shorter account of the *Vāyu*. We have seen that the text of the *Vāyu* was revised and emended more than once. Hence it is not at all improbable that the crude portions also should have been rewritten. Further, the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* were separated undoubtedly after the *Vāyu* account had been extended to the rise of the Guptas and also even after the text of the *Vāyu* had begun to be tampered with, for the *Brahmāṇḍa* not only contains the extended portion of the dynastic account of the *Vāyu* but agrees more closely with the printed text of the *Vāyu* than with the Ms (*eVāyu* of the India Office Library) referred to.

The view of Mr. Pargiter that the *Bhaviṣya* was subjected to two revisions in the early centuries of the Christian era² is purely an assumption without any evidence in its support. The accounts in the three Purāṇas *Matsya*, *Vāyu*, and *Brahmāṇḍa* also do not seem to have been compared at times, because in that case the readings of the *Matsya*, while agreeing more with those of the Ms *eVāyu* would not have differed so much from those of the printed editions of the *Vāyu*, and the *Brahmāṇḍa* and there would have been every possibility of extending the *Matsya* account to the rise of the Guptas.

We have seen above that the chapters of the second group in the *Matsya*-P. (i. e. those chapters on genealogies of kings in the *Matsya* which are common to itself and the *Vāyu*) were borrowed from the *Vāyu* about the last quarter of the 3rd century A. D. Now, the chapters of the first group (i. e. chapters 11-12, 23-24 and 43-46) may either be contemporaneous with those of the second or they may hail from different ages. The close relation of contents of the chapters of the two groups, however, tends to point to the former alternative. In the first group, chapter 11 opens with a request to Sūta to describe the Solar and Lunar dynasties, and chapter 12 accordingly

¹ Ibid., Introduction, p. xiii.

² Ibid., Introduction, p. xiii.

names the descendants of Ikṣvāku of the Solar dynasty. Next, the Lunar dynasty is taken up. Accordingly, in chapters 23-24 the story of the birth of Budha is narrated and his descendants down to Yadu, Turvasu, Druhyu, Anu and Puru are named; and chapters 43-46 name the descendants of Yadu and give accounts of some of them. Let us now pass on to the second group, in which chapter 47 narrates the stories of the Yādavas, of Kṛṣṇa, of the wars between gods and demons, etc; chapter 48 names the descendants of Turvasu, Druhyu and Anu with their accounts; chapters 49-50 (verses 1-67) name the descendants of Puru down to Adhiṣomakṛṣṇa; chapter 50 (verses 68-end) names the future kings from Adhiṣomakṛṣṇa to Kṣemaka; and chapters 271-3 further continue the names and accounts of the future kings and races.

The above contents will show how closely the chapters of the two groups are related. Without the chapters of the second group, the accounts given by those of the first are incomplete, for the descendants of Turvasu, Druhyu, Anu and Puru are no less important than those of Yadu but are equally required for the fullness of the account. It is, therefore, highly probable that the original author, or rather compiler, of the present *Matsya-P.* wrote, or borrowed from some unknown source, the chapters of the first group and supplemented them with those of the second. Consequently, the date of the earlier form of the present *Matsya-P.* seems to be the same as that of *Matsya's* borrowing the chapters of the second group from the Vāyu i. e. about the last quarter of the 3rd or the first quarter of the 4th century A. D.

Let us now pass on to the Smṛti-chapters, which form the major portion of the present *Matsya-P.* In this Purāṇa śrāddha is dealt with in chapters 16-22; vrata in chapters 7, 54-57, 60-66, 69-81 and 95-101; dāna in chapters 53, 82-92, 205-206 and 274-289; tirtha in chapters 13 (verses 10-end), 22, 103-112 (on Prayāga-māhātmya), 180-185 (on Avimuktakṣetra-māhātmya), and 186-194 (on Narmadā-māhātmya); āśrama-dharma in chapter 40; snāna in chapters 67, 68 and 102; pratisthā in chapters 58-59 and 264-270; strīdharma in chapter 7 (verses 37-49); naraka in chapter 39; grahayajña and śānti in chapters 93, 94 and 228-239; rāja-dharma in chapters 215-243; vyavahāra in chapter 227;

utsarga in chapter 207; yuga-dharma in chapters 142, 144, 145 and 165; prāyaścitta in chapter 227 (verses 34ff); and vāstu in chapters 252-257 and 268-270.

Before proceeding to discuss the dates of these chapters we should turn our attention to the chapters common to the *Matsya* and the *Padma-P.* (sṛṣṭi-khaṇḍa) in order to see whether the former borrowed these chapters from the latter or vice versa. The chapters common to the two Purāṇas are the following:-

Mat. 5-6 =	Pad. 6
„ 7-9 =	„ 7
„ 10-12 =	„ 8
„ 13 (verses 1-9) and 14-17 =	„ 9
„ 18-21 =	Pad. 10 (except verses 15-20a)

Mat. 22 (except verses 1a and 2-10a) Pad. = 11 (ex. verses 2-3 and 10-11a)

Mat. 23 and 24 (verses 1-54) = Pad. 12 (verses 1-96)

Mat. 43 (ex. verses 1-4) = Pad. 12 (verses 97-end)

Mat. 44 (ex. verses 1-14a), 45-46, 47 (verses 1-181 ex. 9b and 10b-11a) = Pad. 13 (verses 1-279)

Mat. 100, 101 (ex. verses 70 and 73b-74a), and 102 (ex. verses 27b-30a) = Pad. 20 (ex. verses 1-3, 129, 136-9 and 171-2)

Mat. 81, 82 (ex. verses 23a-and 24), 83-92, 74-75. 76 (ex. verse 13) and 77-80 Pad. = 21

Mat. 61-64, and 66 = Pad. 22 (ex. verses 63 and 165-175)

Mat. 69-70 = Pad. 23

Mat. 71-72 = Pad. 24

Mat. 55 = Pad. 25 (ex. verses 34-37)

Mat. 57-58 = Pad. 26-27

Mat. 59 = Pad. 28 (ex. verses 23-end)

Mat. 60 = Pad. 29

Mat. 164 (ex. v rse 3), and 165-178 = Pad. 39-41

Mat. 146 (verses 41-end) = Pad. 42 (verses 5-40)

Mat. 147 (ex. verses 5b, 6b-9, 10b, 11b-14a and 15-16) = Pad. 42 (verses 41-59)

Mat. 148 (ex. verses 1b, 4-6a, 8-10, 12-19, 22a, 25-37, 39b-41a, 44-50 53, 57-58a, 66-72, 85b-97) = Pad. 42 (verses 66-104, ex. 64, 68b-69, 74-75 and 87).

Mat. 153 (verses 222-228^a) = Pad. 42 (verses 105-end, ex. 109b-110).

Mat. 154 (ex. verses 25-26, 29-31a, 51, 82, 127b, 173-174, 180b-181a, 196a, 200, 201b, 216, and so on) = Pad. 43 (ex. verses 5b, 10b, 16a, 17b, 30a, 226 and so on).

Mat. 155-160 (ex. verse 32) = Pad. 44 (ex. verse 125)

Mat. 161 (ex. verses 70b, 72b-73a, 78a and 87), 162 (ex. verses 35-38) and 163 (ex. verses 1-25a) = Pad. 45

Mat. 179 (verses 1-13a) = Pad. 46 (verses 1-4 and 73-81)

The multifarious subjects and stories dealt with in these chapters prove that they could not be based independently on tradition but one of them must have drawn upon the other. A comparison between the two Purāṇas, however, shows that the *Padma* (*srṣṭi*) is the borrower. In those chapters which are common to the *Vāyu*, *Matsya* and *Padma* (*srṣṭi*)¹, the *Padma* follows more the *Matsya* than the *Vāyu*. We have seen above that the *Matsya* drew upon the *Vāyu*. So it stands that the *Matsya* first borrowed these common chapters from the *Vāyu* and the *Padma* (*srṣṭi*) next took them from the *Matsya*. A comparison of chapters common to the *Harivaṃśa*, *Matsya* and *Padma* (*srṣṭi*)² also shows that the *Padma* resembles more the *Matsya* than the *Harivaṃśa*. The reading " Purāṇam paus-kare caiva mayā Dvaipāyanāc-chrutam " of Hv. III, 14 66^a need not mislead us to hold that the Hv. was based on the *Padma* (*srṣṭi*), for both the *Matsya* and the *Padma* (*srṣṭi*) read " Purāṇam puruṣaś-caiva mayā (*Padma* reads *māyām*) Viṣṇu-Hariḥ prabhuh " in the corresponding passages. Besides the above evidences there are also others to show that the *Padma* (*srṣṭi*) is the borrower. Both in *Vāyu* 9 (verses 9, 12, 15, 19 and 31) and *Matsya* 47 (verses 174, 179, 182, 186 and 197) Śukra, the preceptor of the Asuras, is said to have lived invisibly with Jayanti for ten years, whereas in *Padma* (*srṣṭi*) 13

¹ *Vāyu* 73 and 96-98, *Matsya* 14-15 and 47 and *Padma* (*srṣṭi*) 9 (verses 11-71) and 13 (verses 135-279)

² Hv. III, 41-47 and 7-14, *Matsya* 161-171 and *Padma* (*srṣṭi*) chapters 45, 39 and 40.

(verses 274, 277 and 283) the period is lengthened to one hundred years. The occurrence of the words 'śata-varṣāṇi ' and ' varṣa-śatam ' in three places in the *Padma* (srṣṭi) shows that it is not due to the mistake of the scribes but is to be ascribed to the spirit of exaggeration of the people of later ages. Further, in some of the chapters of the *Padma* (srṣṭi) which are traceable in the *Matsya* and the *Viṣṇu-P.*, the names of Viṣṇu have been changed for those of Brahmā, while in others the names or glorifications of Viṣṇu have been left unchanged. Even in those chapters wherein such changes have been made, there are marks left to testify to their originally Vaiṣṇava character (cf. *Padma*, srṣṭi, 7, 115- ' Brahmādyā Viṣṇu-sāyuiyaṃ tato yāsyanti vai nṛpa; 9, 109; etc). Such Vaiṣṇava character of these chapters shows that they did not belong to the *Padma* (srṣṭi), which, we shall see afterwards, was originally meant for the revival of the Brahmā-worship. That the *Padma* (srṣṭi) borrowed the common chapters from the *Matsya* does not seem to have been unknown to the early Smṛti-writers. For example, Anirudhabhaṭṭa, who lived about 1150 A. D., quotes *Padma* (srṣṭi) 10, 13^b and refers to *Padma* (srṣṭi) 10, 15-20^a saying " yat-tu Padma-Purāṇe- ' sampūjya dviḥ-dāmpatyam nānābharṇa-bhūṣitam ' ity-evam-antam *Matsya*-Purāṇa-tulyam-abhidhāy-ādhikam śayyā-dāna-vidhānam-uktaṃ tat pārvatīyānām-eva Kāmarūpādi-vāsinām Brāhmaṇādīnām-avaśyānuṣṭheyam-iti tatraivoktaṃ " (Hāralatā, p. 199). The evidences adduced above are perhaps sufficient to prove that the *Padma* (srṣṭi) is the borrower. It is probably due to this plagiarism of this Purāṇa that it has been rarely drawn upon by the early Nibandha-writers.

Let us now proceed to discuss the dates of the Smṛti-chapters. We shall first take up the chapters (16-22) on śrāddha. These chapters were written by a Vaiṣṇava¹ and introduced into the *Matsya-P.* in connection with the Pitr̥vaṃśa (the genealogy of the Pitr̥s) given in chapters 13-15. The spurious character of all these chapters from 13-22 seems to be proved by their very position. At the outset of chapter 11 Sūta is requested to

¹ Cf. ' varjayet krodhaparātāp smaran-Nārāyaṇam Hariṃ '—16, 45b; atah-param pravakṣyāmi Viṣṇuṃ yad-udīritam—17, 1b; ityāha Keśavaḥ—17, 30b; and so on,

narrate the Solar and Lunar dynasties. Chapter 12, accordingly dealing with the Solar race, ends thus "iti...Sūrya-vaṃśā-nukīrtanam nāma dvādaśo'dhyāyaḥ". But the Lunar race is taken up as late as in chapter 23. Hence the intervening chapters 13-22 seem to have been interpolated later on. The spurious character of these chapters is further proved by the fact that they are wholly unconnected and are introduced all on a sudden without any hint being given beforehand. So, their date is to be placed later than the first quarter of the 4th century A. D. Again, chapters 16-22 (dealing with śrāddha) and chapters 13-15 (on Pitr-vaṃśa) do not appear to have hailed from the same date. At the beginning of chapter 13 Manu requests the Matsya to tell him about the Pitr-vaṃśa and the śrāddha-devatva of the Sun and the Moon. The latter accordingly narrates the Pitr-vaṃśa in chapters 13-15, refers to the Sun and the Moon in the course of chapter 15 (viz: in 15, 43^a and 32^a) and finishes saying :

"haviṣmatāmādhīpatye śrāddha-devaḥ smṛto raviḥ,
etat-vaḥ sarvaṃ-ākhyātaṃ Pitr-vaṃśānukīrtanam,
puṇyaṃ pavitraṃ-āyusyaṃ kīrtaniyaṃ sadā nr̥bhiḥ." (15, 43).

As in chapters 13-15 there is no reference to the chapters on śrāddha, as the Pitr-vaṃśa is complete in chapters 13-15, and as there is no second reference to the śrāddha-devatva of the Sun and the Moon anywhere in chap. 16-22, we may hold that chap. 13-15 formed a distinct unit by themselves and were originally not followed by any chapter or chapters on śrāddha. It is, therefore, probable that chap. 16-22 on śrāddha were interpolated later than chap. 13-15. If periods of at least 50 years each be allowed between the chapters on the genealogies of kings and chap. 13-15 and between the latter and chap. 16-22, then these chapters on śrāddha can not possibly be earlier than the beginning of the 5th century A. D. Now, Devaṇabhaṭṭa quotes numerous verses from *Matsya-P.* chapters 15-19 and 22 in his *Smṛti-candrikā* I and IV, Jīmūtavāhana from chapters 17 and 22 in his *Kāla-viveka*, Aniruddha from chap. 18 in his *Hāratalā*, Ballālasena from chap. 22 in his *Dāna-sāgara*, Aparārka from chap. 15-18 and 22 in his commentary on the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti*, Haradatta from chap. 18 in his commentary on the *Gautama-dharma-sūtra*, Kullūkabhaṭṭa

from chap. 17 and 18 in his commentary on the *Manu-smṛti*, Mādhavācārya from chap. 16, 17 and 18 in his *Parāśarabhāṣya*, Madanapāla from chap. 16 and 17 in his *Madana-pārijāta*, Śrīdatta Upādhyāya from chap. 16 in his *Kṛtyācāra*, Candēśvara from chap. 17 in his *Kṛtya-ratnākara*, Nṛsiṃha Vājapeyin from chap. 18 in his *Nityācāra-pradīpa*, and Govindānanda from chapters 15, 16, 17, 18 and 22 in his *Dāna-kriyā-kaumudī* and *Śrāddha-kriyā-kaumudī*. These quotations made by the Nibandha-writers from different parts of India, show that chap. 16-22 must be dated not later than 1000 A. D. Again, chap. 16-22 are among those which are found common to the *Matsya* and the *Padma* (sṛṣṭi). The quotations made by the early Nibandha-writers like Aniruddha-bhaṭṭa, Aparārka, Ballālasena, Devanabhaṭṭa and Śrīdatta Upādhyāya, from the common chapters of the *Padma* (sṛṣṭi) show that the *Padma* (sṛṣṭi) borrowed these chapters so early that this Purāṇa, with its new additions, had sufficient time not only for circulation in all parts of India but also for replacing the earlier form of the Purāṇa. If at least a century and a half be allowed for such effective circulation, then the lower limit of the date of borrowing is to be placed not later than about 950 A. D. Consequently, the common chapters of the *Matsya* are to be dated earlier still. As chap. 16-22 betray Vaiṣṇava authorship it is probable that they come from the same date as the chapters on vows and gifts.¹

We shall now take up the chapters on vows, gifts, bath, etc. The position of chapters 51-270 between the chapters 43-50 on the one hand and chapters 271-273 on the other appears to prove their spurious character, for the latter two groups of chapters are inti-

¹ If the word 'Brahmaṇya' used along with the words 'Śiva-bhakta', 'Sūrya-bhakta' and 'Vaiṣṇava' in *Matsya* 16, 9-10 is taken to mean 'the worshipper of Brahmā', then we must admit that the worship of Brahmā was still prevalent, otherwise his worshippers would not have been classed with the 'pañkti-pāvanas'. Hence *Matsya* 16-22 could not be later than 650 A. D. Though the *Padma-P.* (sṛṣṭi) reads 'Brāhmaṇa' in the corresponding line (cf. *Pad* sṛṣṭi, 9, 87b) the reading 'Brahmaṇya of the *Matsya* is the correct one, for this latter reading is supported by Devanabhaṭṭa (*Smṛti-candrikā* IV, p. 156), Aparārka (p. 443) and Govindānanda (*Śrāddha-Kriyā-kaumudī*, p. 35). The change from 'Brahmaṇya' to 'Brāhmaṇa' made by the *Padma* (sṛṣṭi) is most probably due to the fact that in the just preceding line it changes 'Śiva-bhakta' to 'Brahma-bhakta'.

mately connected with each other. The Lunar dynasty is taken up in chap. 23 and is described in chap. 23-24 and 43-50. In *Matsya* 50, 68-71 the sages request Sūta to tell them about the future kings and ages. In compliance with this request Sūta undertakes, in *Matsya* 50, 72-76, to speak on the future Kali-yuga and the manvantaras and also to give accounts not only of the future kings in the families of Ilā, Ikṣvāku and Puru but also of the Andhras, Śakas, Yavanas, Pulindas, Kaivartas, Ābhiras and others, who attained regal power. He then gives the list of the future kings of only the line of Puru in *Matsya* 50, 77 to end, the chapter ending thus :

“ ityeṣa Pauravo vaṁśo yathāvad-īha kīrtitaḥ,
dhīmataḥ Pāṇdu-putrasya Arjunasya mahātmanah ”.

At the beginning of chapter 271 the sages say to Sūta :

“ Puror-vaṁśas-tvayā Sūta sa-bhaviṣyo niveditaḥ,
Sūrya-vaṁśe nṛpā ye tu bhaviṣyanti hi tān vada ”

and the latter continues to give lists and accounts of the other future kings and the future ages in accordance with the promise he makes in 50, 72-76. From all this it is quite evident that chapters 271-3 have been separated from chap. 50. Of course, this separation might be due to the misplacement of chap. 271-3 which is not quite unlikely. We should, therefore, turn our attention to other things. The internal evidences show that at least a good number of the chapter on dāna, vrata, snāna etc. were inserted into *Matsya-P.* at the same time. In *Matsya* 53, 1 the sages ask Sūta not only to enumerate the Purāṇas but also to “ deal exhaustively with the piety of making gifts ” (dāna-dharmam aśeṣam tu). Consequently, in chap. 53, 3ff Sūta speaks of the Purāṇas and Upa-Purāṇas and the gifts of these on particular occasions. Next, proceeding to speak on the gifts connected with vows and fasting in chapters 54ff, he begins saying :

“ atahparam pravakṣyāmi dāna-dharmān-aśeṣataḥ ।
vratopavāsa-samyuktān yathā Matsyoditān-īha ।
Mahādevasya samvāde Nāradasya ca dhīmataḥ ”

The expression ‘ pravakṣyāmi dāna-dharmān-aśeṣataḥ ’ is certainly used by Sūta in compliance with the request made by the sages in 53, 1. It, therefore, shows that chap. 53 and those chapters (viz : 54-57, 61, 68 and 83-92) on vratas and dānas (because the making of ceremonial gifts also is to be accompanied with

fasting) in which Mahādeva and Nārada are the interlocutors are contemporaneous. The genuineness of these latter chapters need not be doubted, for, the request made by Nārada to Śiva in 54, 4 to tell him how the Śiva and Viṣṇu-worshippers could attain health, beauty etc., shows that the chapters in which Mahādeva and Nārada are to be the interlocutors should be Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava; and in fact they are so with the only exception of chap. 61 (dealing with Agastya-pūjā). Chapters 83-92 were all inserted at the same time in a group, for they are all enumerated by Śiva at the very beginning of these chapters (viz: in 83, 4-6). All these contemporaneous chapters (viz. 54-57, 61, 68 and 83-92) are interspersed by many others (viz. 58-60, 62-65, 66-67, 69-80 and 81-82) on vrata, pratiṣṭhā, snāna and dāna in which the interlocutors differ¹. The unconnected position of these chapters and the breaches they create in the dialogue between Mahādeva and Nārada prove their comparatively late dates. In these comparatively late chapters, again, there are some which seem to date still later. These are chapters 65, 73 and 76. The list of contents of the *Matsya* given in chapter 291 does not mention the Akṣaya-tṛtīyā-vrata (chap. 65). Guru-Śukra-pūjā-vidhi (chap. 73) and Viṣṇu-vrata (chap. 99). Therefore, these seem to be later additions. This doubt is further strengthened by their absence from the *Padma-P.* (sṛṣṭi-kh.). The late age of chap. 76 (dealing with the Phala-saptamī-vrata) is evidenced by the non-mention of this vrata in *Matsya* 74, 2-3 wherein Śiva names the Saura vrata he afterwards speaks of in chap. 74-5 and 77-80.

Thus we get three groups of chapters which are arranged in order of priority :

1. Chap. 54-57	are told by	Mahādeva to Nārada.
„ 58-60	„	Matsya to Manu.
„ 61	„	Mahādeva to Nārada.
„ 62-65	„	Mahādeva (Īśvara) to Umā.
„ 66-67	„	Matsya to Manu.
„ 68	„	Mahādeva to Nārada.
„ 69-80	„	Śiva to Brahmā.
„ 81-82	„	Matsya to Manu
„ 83-92	„	Mahādeva to Nārada.
„ 93	„	Vaiśampāyana to Śaunaka.
„ 94	„	Śiva to (?).
„ 95-112	„	Nandikeśvara to Nārada.

(1) chap. 53, 54-57, 61, 68 and 83-92,

(2) chap. 58-60, 62-64, 66-67, 69-72, 74-75, 77-80 and
81-82,

and (3) chap. 65, 73 and 76.

Now, Nṛsiṃha Vājapeyin of Orissa quotes one verse from chap. 53 in his *Nṛtyācāra-pradīpa*; Govidānanda quotes a number of verses from chapters 53 and 58 in his *Dāna-kriyā-kaumudī*; Candēśvara quotes the entire chapters 56 and 63 and also some verses from chapters 53, 61 and 70 in his *Kṛtya-ratnākara*; Madanapāla quotes verses from chapter 53 in his *Mudana-pārijāta*; Ballālasena quotes entire chapters 82-92 and also verses from chap. 53 in his *Dāna-sāgara*; Aparārka quotes almost the entire chapters 53, 58-59 and 82-92 in his commentary on the *Yājñavalkya-smṛiti*; and Jīmūta-vāhana quotes a verse from chap. 53 in his *Kāla-viveka*. These quotations made by the Nibandha-writers hailing from different parts of India, show that the chapters of at least the first two groups were inserted into the *Matsya-P.* much earlier than their times. Otherwise, such wide spread circulation of the Purāṇa would have been impossible. So these chapters must be dated not later than 950 A. D. Again, many of the chapters of the first and second groups and chap. 76 of the third group have been borrowed by the *Padma-P.* (*śrṣṭi*) from the *Matsya*. We have said that this borrowing took place not later than about 950 A. D. Hence the date of the chapters of the *Matsya*, including chap. 76, are to be placed earlier still and most probably not later than at least 900 A. D. We have said above that chap. 76 (on Phala-saptamī-vrata) was added later than chap. 74-5 and 77-80 which belong to the second group. Hence the date of at least these chapters of the second group and consequently also of those of the first, is to be placed further up. The aśala-dānas (gifts of hillocks, -chap. 83-92) require the images of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva which are to be placed on the artificial hillocks to be given away (cf. 83, 15 and 91, 5) and in 58, 24 Brahmā is found to be worshipped equally with the other two gods of the triad. These evidences show that the worship of Brahmā did not die out at the time of insertion of these chapters. Varāha-mihira's mention of only the most

prominent sects of his time¹ shows that the Brahmā-worship was still popular. If, as scholars hold, this god was thrown into the back ground about the beginning of the 7th century A. D., then the date of chap. 58 and the chapters on acaladāna can not be placed later than 650 A. D. Thus we get the lower limit.

The mention of the names of the week-days in connection with the vratas etc. (cf. 55, 4; 57, 4; 64, 5; 70, 33; etc.) shows that these were well-known when these chapters were added. The earliest dated mention of a week-day being traced in the Eran inscription of 484 A. D. these chapters should not be placed very much earlier than this date. *Matsya* 53, 46-7 describe the *Kūrma-P.* in its Vaiṣṇava form. As we have shown that the Vaiṣṇava *Kūrma-P.* was written between 550 and 650 A. D.² this chapter can not be earlier than 550 A. D. The mention of the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu during the worship of the Nakṣatra-puruṣa in *Matsya* 54 (dealing with the Nakṣatra-puruṣa-vrata) and their total absence in *Brhat-saṃhitā*, chap. 105 (dealing with the same vrata) prove the later date of the former. The *Brhat-saṃhitā* was written about 550 A. D. Therefore, the date of *Matsya* 54 is later than 550 A. D. The inclusion of Buddha, in *Matsya* 54 (on Nakṣatra-puruṣa-vrata), among the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu also shows that this chapter could not have been written earlier than 550 A. D. The *Mahābhārata* does not mention the Buddha incarnation though it mentions Kalki in one of the spurious verses in XII, 141. *Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa* chap. 4 names a few incarnations beginning with Varāha and ending with Māthura (i e. Kṛṣṇa), there being no mention of Buddha. The Viṣṇu-P.

1 Viṣṇor-Bhāgavatān Maṅgāś-cā Savituh Sambhoḥ sa-bhasma-dvijān
Mātrīṣām-api Mātrī-maṇḍala-vido Viprān vidur-Brahmaṇaḥ |
Śākyān sarvāhitasya śānta-manaso Nagnān Jinānām vidur
ye yaṃ devam-upāśritāḥ sva-vidhinā tais-tasya kāryā kriyā ||

Brhat-saṃhitā 60, 19.

The mention of only the Bhāgavatas, and not the Pāñcarātras, among the worshippers of Viṣṇu shows that Varāha-mihira mentions only the most powerful sects of his time. We know that the Bhāgavatas grew in power under the Gupta emperors who called themselves 'parama-bhāga-vata'.

² This essay on the *Kūrma-P.* has been published in the June issue of the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, 1935.

3 [*Annals*, B. O. R. I.]

(about 300 A. D.) mentions Kalki but not Buddha. The *Hari-vamśa* (about 400 A. D.) also does not mention Buddha though it mentions Kalki. The lists of incarnations, or rather manifestations, of the *Brahma-P.* are the same as those in the *Mārkaṇḍeya-P.* and the *Hari-vamśa*. The *Jayākhya-saṃhitā* (about 450 A. D.) of the Pāñcarātras does not name Buddha. The *Ahīrbudhnya-saṃhitā* which is certainly later than the *Jayākhya*, mentions 39 Vibhavas in which Kalki is one but the name of Buddha is wanting. Thus the Buddha incarnation seems to have been unknown to the beginning of the sixth century A. D. *Matsy.* 47, 247, which mentions Buddha, is undoubtedly a later interpolation, for there is no mention of Buddha in the corresponding verse of the *Vāyu*. Now, the mention of the Buddha incarnation in the *Gītagovinda* of Jayadeva (about the end of the 12th century), the *Daśāvatāra-carita* of Kṣemendra (11th century A. D.), a hymn by Nammalvar (alias Saint Saṭagopa, 9th century), the Viṣṇupura cards (end of the 7th and beginning of the 8th century), a Pallava inscription of about the latter half of the 7th century A. D. ¹ and the *Bhāgavata-P.* shows that this incarnation attained popularity by the beginning of the 7th century A. D. It is highly probable, therefore, that Buddha began to be regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu from about 550 A. D. That during this time the founders of the heretical religions came to be identified with Viṣṇu is shown by the *Br̥hat-saṃhitā* (58, 45) according to which the image of the god of the Arhats (Arhatām devaḥ) is to be marked with the Śrī-vatsa.

From what has been said above it appears that the chapters of the first two groups were written not earlier than 550 and not later than 650 A. D.

Of the chapters of the third group, chap. 76 is, as we have seen, later than the chapters (74-5 and 77-80) of the second group. As it is found in the *Padma-P.* (sṛṣṭi), it is earlier than 950 A. D. The other two chapters (viz. 65 and 73) are neither mentioned in the list of contents of the *Matsya* given in chap. 291

¹ H. Krishna Shastri, the *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India* Vol. 26, p. 5.

nor in the *Padma-P.* (sṛṣṭi). They are also not drawn by any Nibandha-writer. Therefore, they may be taken to be very late additions.

Matsya chap. 7, verses 6-30 deal with the Madanadvādaśī-vrata observed by Diti for getting a son capable of killing the enemies of the Daityas. As in none of the other Purāṇas Diti is found to observe this vow, this portion of *Matsya* 7 seems to have been interpolated later on. This interpolation was most probably made not later than 900 A. D., for these verses also occur in the *Padma-P.* (sṛṣṭi).

Matsya 95-101 deal with vratas - Śaiva, Saura and Vaiṣṇava. All of these chapters do not seem to have come from the same date. In *Matsya* 95 Śiva, the speaker in the earlier chapters on vrata and dāna, refers Nārada to Nandikeśvara, who is to speak on the 'Māheśvara-dharma'. Consequently, Nārada asks Nandikeśvara to tell him about 'Māheśvara-vrata,' and the latter describes the 'Śiva-caturdaśī-vrata' (chap. 95) and the 'Sarva-phala-tyāga-vrata' (chap. 96) both of which are Śaiva. But in chap. 97-112, which also are ascribed to Nandikeśvara the Saura and Vaiṣṇava vratas and Prayāga-māhātmya are treated of. Hence these chapters (97-112) must have been added by the non-Śaivas later than chap. 95-96. The strictly Śaiva character of chapters 95-96, as contrasted with those chapters on vrata and dāna in which Śiva and Nārada are the interlocutors, and the fact that Nandikeśvara, the narrator in chap. 95-96, is introduced to Nārada by Śiva, show that chap. 95-96 were added by a Śaiva later than those chapters in which Śiva and Nārada are the interlocutors. Therefore, these two chapters (95-96) can not be dated earlier than 600 A. D. Now, Caṇḍeśvara quotes a few verses from chap. 95 and 101 in his *Kṛtya-ratnākara*, Madanapāla from chap. 101 in his *Madana-pārijāta*, and Devanabhaṭṭa from chap. 101 in his *Smṛti-candrikā* II. These quotations show that chap. 95 and 101 are to be dated earlier than 1100 A. D. Chap. 100 and 101 have been borrowed by the *Padma-P.* (sṛṣṭi). Therefore, these two chapters should not be placed later than about 900 A. D. The *Bhaviṣya-P.* also has borrowed chap. 95-100. Hence the dates of *Matsya* chapters 95-101 fall between 600 and 900 A. D. Chap. 95-96 being earlier than chapters 97-101, the

former should be dated in the former part and the latter in the latter part of this period.

Matsya chapters 205–206 on gifts and chap. 207 on the dedication of bulls (*vr̥ṣotsarga*) seem to have been misplaced. Chapter 115 opens thus :

Manur -uvāca

caritaṃ Budha-putrasya Janārdana mayā śrutaṃ ।
 śrutaḥ śrāddha-vidhiḥ puṇyaḥ sarva-pāpa-praṇāśanaḥ ॥
 dhenvāḥ prasūyamānāyāḥ phalaṃ dānasya me śrutaṃ ।
 kṛṣṇājina-pradānaṃ-ca vr̥ṣotsargas-tathaiva ca ।
 śrutvā rūpaṃ narendrasya Budha-putrasya Keśava ।
 kautūhalaṃ samutpannaṃ tan-mamācakaṣva pr̥cchataḥ ॥

etc.

etc.

This opening shows that this chapter was immediately preceded by the story of Purūravas (the son of Budha) in which he was praised for his physical beauty, and also by chapters on śrāddha, prasūyamāna-dhenu-dāna, kṛṣṇājina-dāna and vr̥ṣotsarga. Now, the story of Purūravas is found in chap. 24 (verses 11–32), śrāddha in chap. 16–22, prasūyamāna-dhenu-dāna in chap. 205, Kṛṣṇājina-dāna in chap. 206 and vr̥ṣa-lakṣaṇa in chap. 207. That *Matsya* 24 (11–32), dealing with the story of Purūravas, is aimed at by the expression ' caritaṃ Budha-putrasya..... etc. ' is shown by the fact that it is in this portion (viz. 24, 12) that Purūravas is called very beautiful so much so that Urvaśī, the divine nymph, falls in love with him. There are also other evidences to show that chap. 205–207 immediately followed the chapters (16–22) on śrāddha. *Matsya* 204, in which the Pitr-gāthās only are laid down but which ends with the verse " etāvad-uktaṃ tava bhūmi-pāla śrāddhasya kalpaṃ muni-saṃpradiṣṭaṃ etc " points to chap. 16–22 termed ' śrāddha-kalpa ' and is, therefore, a continuation of these chapters. The mention of the prasūyamāna-dhenu-dāna, kṛṣṇājina-dāna and vr̥ṣotsarga in this chapter (i. e. chap. 204) shows that it preceded chap. 205–207 dealing with these topics. Hence the real order of these misplaced chapters seems to have been as follows :

Chap. 16–22, chap. 204–207, chap. 24 and chap. 115–120. This order is supported by the *Viṣṇu-dharmottara* which borrows,

among others, the chapters 207 (24^b-end) and 115-120 from the *Matsya* and in which the story of Purūravas is immediately preceded by vṛṣotsarga.¹

We have seen above that chap. 205-207 stand in close connection with the chap. (16-22) on śrāddha. This connection shows that the former could by no means be earlier than the latter, and it is highly probable that these two groups of chapters come from the same date. That chap. 205-207 were inserted into the *Matsya* earlier than 1100 A. D. is doubtless, for Govindānanda quotes verses from chapters 205-207 in his *Dāna-kriyā-kaumudī* and *Śuddhi-kriyā-kaumudī*, Śūlapāṇi quotes two lines from chap. 206 in his *Prāyaścitta-viveka*, Ballālasena quotes the entire chapters 205 (except verse 1) and 206 (except the last verse) and three verses from chap. 207 in his *Dāna-sāgara*, and Aparārka quotes chap. 205 (ex. verse 1) and 206 (except the first and last verses) in his commentary on *Yāj.*

Matsya 274-289 deal with the sixteen mahādānas (great gifts) which, requiring the worship of Viṣṇu, are certainly Vaiṣṇava in character. The mention of these 16 mahādānas in chap. 274 (4-10) shows that all of the chapters 274-289 come from the same date. These chapters are frequently drawn upon by the Nibandha-writers early and late. Govindānanda quotes verses from *Matsya* 274 in his *Śuddhi-kriyā-kaumudī*, Ballālasena gives the entire chapters 274-289 in his *Dāna-sāgara*, and Aparārka quotes chapters 274 (ex. verses 3^a, 13^b and 28^b), 275 (ex. the last verse), 277 (ex. the last verse), 278 (ex. the last verse), 279, 280 (ex. the last verse) and 281-289 in his commentary. These quotations show that these chapters must be dated not later than 1050 A. D. The *Līṅga-Purāṇa* deals with the mahādānas in II,

¹ Vide *Viṣṇu-dharmottara* I, 146, 41b-end and I, 148-154 (verse: 1-7) which are the same as *Matsya* 207 (24b-end) and 115-120 respectively.

The *Viṣṇu-dharmottara* is suspected to be the borrower for the following reasons:

(1) In the *Viṣṇu-dh.* the story of Purūravas is further continued to chap. 156.

(2) Though the opening verses of *Viṣṇu-dh.* I, 148 are the same as those of *Matsya* 115, in the former there is no chapter on prastīyamāna-dhenu-dāna or kṛṣṇājīna-dāna preceding chap. 148.

(3) In the *Viṣṇu-dh.* the chapters on vṛṣotsarga and the story of Purūravas are introduced almost abruptly.

28ff. Ballālasena says that the mahādānas dealt with in the *Līṅga* were based on those of the *Matsya*.¹ As in the *Līṅga* the mahādānas were inserted before the time of Ballālasena the chapters (274-289) of the *Matsya* should be dated earlier still and reasonably not later than 1000 A. D. The references to the worship of the images of Brahmā during the different mahādānas² prove that the worship of the god was still popular. So these chapters (274-289) can not be dated later than 650 A. D. The ten incarnations of Viṣṇu including Buddha and Kalki being mentioned in *Matsya* 285, 7, these chapters can not be dated earlier than 550 A. D. Therefore, their date falls between 550 and 650 A. D.

Let us now take up the chapters on tīrtha. *Matsya* 13, verses 10-end describe, quite incoherently, the story of the self-immolation of Sati, the daughter of Dakṣa, in which she is appeased to name the numerous holy places sacred to herself. The position of these verses in chapters 13 (dealing with the Pitr̥s) and their obvious Śākta character testify to their late date. Their late age is further proved by their mention of Rādhā in 13, 38 (Rādhā Br̥ndāvane vane) and their position in the *Padma-P.* (sṛṣṭi). Though chap. 9 of this Purāṇa is the same as *Matsya* 13 (verses 1-9) and 14-17, these verses which are included in *Matsya* 13, are found in the *Padma-P.* (sṛṣṭi) as late as in 17, 182-216^a. Hence we may be sure that these verses were taken by the Śāktas from a common source and interpolated independently in those parts of these two Purāṇas which the interpolators thought suited for them.

Chapters 103-112 (on Prayāga-māhātmya) of the *Matsya* are later than *Kūrma-P.* I, 35-38 which again, can not be dated earlier than 750, or rather 800 A. D. Hence the chapters of the

¹ 'bṛhad-api Līṅga-Purāṇam Matsya-Purāṇoditair-mahādānaiḥ.....etc. *Dānasāgara*, fol. 3b.

² Brahmā, Śiva and Viṣṇu are to be worshipped on the altar constructed during the tulā-puruṣa-mahādāna, etc. (*Matsya* 274, 30); in the kalpa-pādapa-mahādāna, the kalpa-pādapa is to be placed on a heap of coarse sugar (guḍa) with Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva and Sūrya (*Matsya* 277, 6); the images of Brahmā and Anantaśakti are to be placed on a heap of salt in hema-kalpa-latā-dāna (*Matsya* 286, 6); and the golden image of Brahmā is to be placed on salt during the sapta-sāgara-dāna (*Matsya* 287, 7).

Matsya should be dated not earlier than 850 A. D. As most of these chapters are profusely drawn upon by Vācaspatimiśra and Candēśvara they are certainly not later than 1250 A. D.

The chapters on Prayāga-māhātmya (told by Mārkaṇḍeya to Yudhiṣṭhira) are not free from interpolations, for there are evidences which go against the authenticity of at least verses 1-17 of chap. 112. Though upto *Matsya* 112, 17 the sage Mārkaṇḍeya is nowhere said to have parted with Yudhiṣṭhira, in *Matsya* 112, 4 the former is said to have come to the latter, blessed him and then repa'ired to his hermitage. This is quite contradictory. Again in *Matsya* 112, 18 Nandikeśvara says " ityuktṡā sa mahābhāgo Mārkaṇḍeyo mahātapāh,

Yudhiṣṭhirasya nṛpates-tatraivāntar-adhiyata." The word ' ity-uktṡā ' would have been meaningless if the preceding verses were not spurious, for they are spoken by Vāsudeva. Hence it follows that *Matsya* 112, 1-17 are interpolated.

Matsya 180-185 (on Avimuktakṣetra or Benares) come from a fairly early date. A comparison between these chapters and *Kūrma*-P. I, 30-34 (on Benares) shows that the former are earlier than the latter. Though in both the Purāṇas (*Matsya* 181, 6-7 and *Kūrma* I, 30, 16) the Avimuktakṣetra-māhātmya is said to have been told by Śīva to Umā on the mount Meru, the chapters of the latter consist of the glorification of some Śīva-līngas, viz. Omkāra, Kṛttivāseśvara, Madhyameśvara, etc, at Benares. They also contain some fanciful stories about the origin or power of these līngas. Besides these, there is a story glorifying the Piśāca-mocana-kuṇḍa lying near the Kapardīśvara līnga. These names and stories, which are undoubtedly of later origin, are not found in the *Matsya*. Now, *Kūrma* I, 30-34 are dated not later than the middle of the 13th century A. D. Therefore, chapters 180-185 of the *Matsya* should not be placed later than 1200 A. D. As Govindānanda quotes verses from chap. 184 in his *Śrāddha-kṛiyā-kaumudī*, Vācaspatimiśra from chap. 180-184 in his *Tīrtha-cintāmaṇi*, Maḍanapāla from chap. 184 in his *Madana-pārijāta*, Mādhavācārya from the same chap. in his *Parāśara-bhāṣya* and Aparārka from chap. 184 in his commentary on *Yāj.*, we may be sure that chapters 180-185 were inserted into the *Matsya* not later than at least 1075 A. D. The

strictly Śaiva character of these chapters tends to show that they were added later than 700 A. D.

Matsya 186-194, on Narmadā-māhātmya, must have been composed by a Śaiva living somewhere about the northern bank of the Narmadā¹. These chapters must have been interpolated at a very late date. They seem to be later than *Kūrma-P.* II, 33-39, which, again, are later than 800 A. D. Their late date seems further to be proved by the fact that no Nibandha-writer has been found to draw upon them.

Matsya 39 and 40, treating respectively of naraka and āśrama-dharma, are included in the story of Yayāti extending over chap. 25-43. This story seems to have been interpolated later on, because the *Padma-P.* (srṣṭi) in which *Matsya* chapters 5-24 and 44ff are found borrowed in the same order, omits this story. As no Nibandha-writer has been found to quote from these chapters, we are not sure about the lower limit of their date.

Snāna is dealt with in *Matsya* chapters 67-68 and 102. Of these, chapters 67 and 68 have already been dated between 550 and 650 A. D. Chap. 102, being drawn upon by Govindānanda in his *Śuddhi-kriyā-kaumudī* and by Devnabhaṭṭa in his *Smṛti-candrikā* II, can not be dated later than 1100 A. D. As this chapter has been borrowed by the *Padma* (srṣṭi), it should not be placed later than 950 A. D. It has been shown above that chap. 97-112 are later than chap. 95-96 which, again, are later than 600 A. D. Therefore, chap. 102 cannot possibly be earlier than 650 A. D. Thus the date of this chapter falls between 650 and 950 A. D.

Pratisthā (consecration) is the subject matter of *Matsya* 58-59 and 264-270. Of these the former two have been dated between 550 and 650 A. D. The latter two chapters, dealing with the consecration of the images of gods, are certainly contemporaneous with chap. 258-263 in which the characteristics of the different images of gods have been laid down. A comparison between *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* chap. 58 (dealing with pratimā-lakṣaṇa) and *Matsya*

¹ Cf. chap. 186, verses 8a, 10, and 11 in which the Narmadā is glorified even over the Ganges, Yamunā and Sarasvatī. Also cf. 186, 52a; 190, 1f etc. wherein the northern bank of the Narmadā is said to be equal to the Rudraloka. The Śaiva character of these chapters is quite obvious,

258-270 show that the former must be earlier than the latter. The *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* names the following gods with their respective characteristics.

(1) Rāma, the son of Daśaratha, (2) Bali, the son of Virocana, (3) Baladeva, the carrier of the plough, (4) Devī (i. e. Lakṣmī), (5) Śāmba, (6) Pradyumna, (7) the two wives of Śāmba and Pradyumna, (8) Brahmā, (9) Skanda, (10) Mahendra, (11) Śambhu, (12) Buddha (for the Buddhists), and (13) the god of the Arhats (for the Jains).

The *Matsya-P.* omits (3), (6), (7), (12) and (13) but adds the following: Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Nṛsiṃha, Vāmana, Rudra, Ardha-nārīśvara, Umā-Maheśvara, Śiva-Nārāyaṇa, Vināyaka, Kātyāyanī, Agni, Yama, Nairṭa, Varuṇa, Vāyu, Kuvera, Gadādhara, the Mātṛs (viz: Brahmāṇī, Māheśvarī, Kaumārī, Vaiṣṇavī, Vārāhī, Indrāṇī, Yogeśvarī, Cāmuṇḍā, and Kālīkā) and Kusumāyudha. The innovations made in the chapters of the *Matsya* prove that they can not be earlier than 550 A. D. As Aparārka quotes verses from chap. 265 and 267, they can not be later than 1100 A. D. The retention of Brahmā by the *Matsya* in spite of its additions and alterations in the list of gods given by the *Bṛhat-saṃhitā*, shows that the Brahmā-worship did not die out. Moreover, according to the *Matsya*, the priest is required to be 'Brahm-opendra-Hara-priya' (*Matsya* 265, 7); the Brāhma mantras are to be used in consecrating the image of Brahmā (*Matsya* 267, 39); and the gods, who are to be summoned at the time of consecrating the image of any god, include Brahmā (*Matsya* 267, 42). All these references prove the popularity of the Brahma-worship at the time when *Matsya* 258-270 were written. Hence these chapters are to be dated earlier than about 650 A. D., and thus their date falls between 550 and 650 A. D.

Matsya chapter 7, verses 37-49 lay down the duties of pregnant women. These verses, being vitally connected with the story of the birth of the Maruts, appear to come from the date when the extant *Matsya-P.* was first written or compiled. That they are not later than 1100 A. D. and most probably also than 950 A. D. is shown by the quotations made from them by Devanabhaṭṭa in his *Smṛti-candrikā* I and by the occurrence of these verses in the *Padma* (śṛṣṭi).

Matsya 215-243 and 252-257, treating of rāja-dharma, graha-yajña, adbhuta-sānti, yātrā-kāla-vidhāna, subhāsubha-nirūpaṇa, vāstu and vyavahāra, must have come from the same date, because all these are meant for the king. The determination of even their approximate date is rather difficult. That they are not later than 1000 A. D. is sure, for Bhavadeva quotes verses from chap. 227 in his *Prāyaścitta-prakaraṇa*, Aparārka from chap. 253 in his commentary on *Yāj.*, Devanabhaṭṭa from chap. 227 in his *Smṛti-candrikā* I, and Ballālasena from chap. 228-238 in his *Adbhuta-sāgara*. The reference to the unpopularity of the worship of Brahmā in *Matsya* 225, 12-14, wherein it is said that the people worshipped the fierce (daṇḍinaḥ-punishing) gods Rudra, Agni, Sūrya, Viṣṇu and others instead of the mild (praśānta-serene) Brahmā, Pūṣan and Aryaman, shows that *Matsya* 215-243 and 252-257 can not possibly be dated earlier than 600, or rather 650, A. D.

Matsya 93 and 94 deal with graha-sānti and graharūpākhyāna respectively. These chapters are certainly not later than 1000 A. D., because Śūlapāṇi quotes two lines from chap. 93 in his *Vrata-kāla-viveka*, Devanabhaṭṭa quotes a verse from chap. 93 in his *Smṛti-candrikā* II, Aparārka quotes the entire chap. 94 and a good number of verses from chap. 93 in his commentary, the *Trikāṇḍa-maṇḍana* has one verse from chap. 93, and Vijñāneśvara quotes the entire chap. 94 in his *Mitākṣarā* (under *Yāj.* I, 297-298^a). The interlocutors (viz. Vaiśampāyana and Śaunaka in chap. 93 and Śiva alone in chap. 94), who appear abruptly without any introduction but who are not found in the chapters preceding or following chap. 93 and 94, prove that these two chapters are later than at least those chapters on vrata and dāna in which Śiva and Nārada are the interlocutors. These latter chapters we assigned to 550-650 A. D. Therefore, chap. 93-94 can not be earlier than about 650 A. D. Thus their date falls between 650 and 1000 A. D.

Yuga-dharma is dealt with in chapters 142, 144, 145 and 165. Of these, the former three are the same as *Vāyu* 57 (verses 1-85), 58 and 59 respectively. They most probably come from the time when the extant *Matsya-P.* borrowed some of its chapters from the *Vāyu*. Their position between *Matsya* 50 and 271-3 (on the future dynasties and ages) must be due to misplacement. *Matsya* 165,

which has been borrowed by the *Padma* (sṛṣṭi), should be dated not later than about 950 A. D.

In the foregoing pages we have tried to determine the dates of the different Smṛti-chapters of the *Matsya-P.* The results of our investigation are given below in a tabular form:—

Chapters	Periods of insertion
16-22	400-950 A. D. Probably between 550 and 650 A. D.
53, 54-57, 61, 68 and 83-92	550-650 A. D.
58-60, 62-65, 66-67, 68-72, 74-75, 77-80 and 81-82	550-650 A. D. (comparatively later than the chaps. in the second group).
76	650-950 A. D.
65 and 73	Uncertain. Surely much later.
7 (verses 6-30)	Most probably not later than 900 A. D.
95-96 and 97-101	600-900 A. D. The former two chaps. are earlier than the latter.
205-207	Not earlier than 400 A. D. and not later than 1100 A. D. Probably between 550 and 650 A. D.
274-289	550-650 A. D.
13 (verses 10-end)	Late interpolation.
103-112	850-1250 A. D.
180-185	700-1075 A. D.
186-194	Very late (later than 800 A. D.)
39-40	Late but uncertain.
102	650-950 A. D.
258-270	550-650 A. D.
7 (verses 37-49)	Not later than 950 A. D. Most probably as old as the date of composition of the extant <i>Matsya</i> .
215-243 and 252-257	650-1000 A. D.
93-94	650-1000 A. D.

Chapters	Periods of insertion
142, 144 and 145	Most probably the same as the date of composition of the extant <i>Matsya</i> .
165	Probably not later than 950 A. D.

In connection with the Smṛti-chapters we should like to say a few words on the date and authenticity of some of the remaining chapters. *Matsya* 52, dealing with karma-yoga, recommends the worship of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva and Sūrya, who are to be considered as not different from one another (*Matsya* 52, 23f.). The author of this chapter seems to be a Viṣṇu-worshipper, for he defines Vāsudeva as 'atindriya,' 'śānta', 'sūkṣma', 'avyakta', 'sanātana' and 'jagan-mūrti' and calls Brahmā, Śiva, Sūrya and others his 'vibhūti'. Therefore, the date of this chap. can not possibly be later than 650 A. D. The story of Purūravas in chap. 115-120 is of comparatively late origin. It says how Purūravas, the son of Budha, attained extraordinary physical beauty by fasting on every dvādaśī tithi and by worshipping Viṣṇu in the Himālayas respectively in two of his previous births. Ballāla-sena's quotation of *Matsya* 115, 14 in his *Dāna-sāgara* (fol. 23^a), however, shows that chap. 115-120 are at least not later than 1100 A. D. The story of Sāvitrī in chap. 208-214, on account of its innovations befitting later taste, can be taken to be a late interpolation. It says that Aśvapati, king of Madra, worshipped the goddess Sāvitrī and was gifted with a daughter who was consequently named after the goddess, and that four days before the death of Satyavān, Sāvitrī fasted for three days and observed the Sāvitrī-vrata. Besides these there are also other innovations.

From what has been said above about the dates of the different chapters of the *Matsya-P.* it appears that this Purāṇa was subjected to additions, and also perhaps to alterations, more than once. That some of its chapters have been lost is shown by the quotations made by Devanabhaṭṭa and Aparārka on dāna and ekādaśī-upavāsa. In the extant *Matsya* there is no chapter treating of these topics.

The extant *Matsya-P.* seems to have been written, or rather compiled, originally by the Vaiṣṇavas. At least this impression is created by the earlier portions that have been retained. In *Matsya* 1, 23-25 the supernatural power which the Fish displays in rapid growth and huge size is said to be possible only with Vāsudeva, for, Manu says, 'none other than he can be such'; *Matsya* 9, 39 says that at the end of each thousand years the Manus perish and Brahmā and other gods (Brahmādyāḥ) attain the proximity of Viṣṇu; in *Matsya* 23, 17 Nārāyaṇa is called 'Paramātman'; in *Matsya* 24 (verses 11, 36 etc.) many ancient kings, viz. Purūravas, Rāji and others, are said to have practised austerity for the favour of Viṣṇu; and so on. In the verses referred to above Viṣṇu has been assigned the highest position, and these seem to be the traces of the original Vaiṣṇava character of the *Matsya*.

On the strength of the great prominence given to the region about the Godāvari in *Matsya* 114, 37-39 (on geography) it has been suggested that the place of composition of the *Matsya-P.* was Nasik¹. This suggestion seems to have a very weak basis, for these verses of the *Matsya* tally with *Vāyu* 45, 112-114, and we have seen that the *Matsya* borrowed some chapters from the *Vāyu*. The close agreement between the majority of the geographical chapters in the two Purāṇas seems to confirm the indebtedness of the *Matsya* to the *Vāyu*. Hence to find out the place of origin of the present *Matsya* we shall have to look to those of its original chapters which have not been found to be borrowed from any other work. Such a one is chap. 2. In it the river Narmadā, and not the famous Ganges, is said to remain even after the destruction of the world (*Matsya* 2, 13). Elsewhere, in chap. 15 (which most probably comes from a little later date) this river "which flows through the Deccan" is called the 'mānasī kanyā' of the Somapa Pitṛs living in the Mānasa loka (*Matsya* 15, 25-28). These passages tend to show that the *Matsya-P.* was composed and circulated by some Vaiṣṇava living somewhere about the river Narmadā.

¹ Hara Prasāda Śāstrī, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss.*, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. V, Preface, p. 190.

We give below a list of those verses quoted by the comparatively early Nibandha-writers from the '*Matsya-Purāṇa*' which we have been able to trace in the Vaṅgavāsi edition of the same Purāṇa.

(1) *Smṛti-candrikā* Matsya-P.
of Devanabhatta)

I
p. 46 = 7, 37^b-38^a; 40^b; 44^b
-45^a; 46-47.

157 = 17, 6-8.

180 = 18, 30.

II
296 = 102, 13.

322 = 101, 37.

419 = 93, 111.

486 = 102, 2-8.

487 = 102, 9^b-10^a.

517 = 102, 14-21 & 23^b

III
ii. 481 = 227, 146^a (the other
line differs)

IV
28 = 17, 4-5^a.

29 = 17, 6-8.

53, 72, 76, 77-78—On ekādaśī

82 = 22, 84

83 (twice) = 16, 21; 22, 85

84 (twice) = 22, 83 and 88

121 = 22, 88

156 (twice) = 16, 8^b-10^a; (other
quotation is not found)

191 = 16, 19^a

194-195 = 16, 19^b-20

215 = 15, 39^a (the first line
is not found)

255 = 17, 30

265 = 15, 37^b-38^a

270-271 = 16, 27^b-28^a

271 = 16, 28^b-29^a

272 = 19, 4^a

290-291 = 17, 14^b-15^a

Smṛti-candrikā Matsya-P.

291 = 17, 23

298 = 19, 4-11^a (except 4^b
and 5^a)

340 = 17, 28^b

358 = 17, 40^b-41

375 = 17, 47^b

388 = 17, 49^b

389 (twice) = 16, 47^a and 17,
53^a-55 (ex. one
line after verse
54)

406 = 17, 61^b

409 = 17, 62

412 = 16, 56-57^a

438-439 = 17, 69

(2) *Prājyāścitta-prakaraṇa*
(of Bhavadeva)

p. 5 = 227, 118^b-120^a

(3) *Kāla-viveka*

(of Jīmūta-vāhana)

p. 101 = 17, 9

292 = 61, 49^a (the other
line is not found)

304 = (this is same as
Brahma-P. 220, 14)

321 = 274, 19^b-22^a

369 = 22, 83

370 = 22, 88

391 = (the same as Bra-
hma-P. 220, 53^b-54)

400 = 17, 4^a (the other
line is not found)

418 = 17, 9

520 = 17, 5^b-8

(4) *Hāratalā* *Matsya-P.*

(of Aniruddha)

p. 98 = 18, 30

162 = 18, 5-7

198 = 18, 12^b-14^a

(5) *Mitākṣarā* *Matsya-P.*

(of Vijñāneśvara)

under Yāj. I, 297-298^a = Chap. 94

(6) *Dāna-Sāgara* *Matsya-P.*

(of Ballālasena)

folio 6^a = 274, 1

„ 15^b-16^a = 22, 27^b-28, 30^b-

36, 49-55^a, 57-59,

68, 73^b-75^a, 71^a

„ 18^a = 206, 23^b-24^a

„ 23^a = 115, 14

„ 27^a-31^b = Chap. 274

„ 39^b-41^a = Chap. 275

„ 42^b-44^a = „ 276

„ 45^b-46^b = „ 277

„ 48^b-50^a = „ 278

„ 52^a-53^a = „ 279

„ 54^a-55^a = „ 280

„ 56^a-57^a = „ 281

„ 58^b-59^a = „ 282

„ 61^a-62^a = „ 283

„ 63^b-64^b = „ 284

„ 66^a-67^b = „ 285

„ 69^a-70^a = „ 286

„ 71^a-72^a = „ 287

„ 73^a-74^a = „ 288

„ 77^a-77^b = „ 289

„ 79^a-81^b = „ 83

„ 87^a-87^b = „ 84

„ 88^a = „ 85

„ 88^b-89^a = „ 86

„ 89^a-89^b = „ 87

„ 89^b-90^a = „ 88

(except the first line)

Dāna-Sāgara *Matsya-P.*

fol. 90^a-90^b = chap. 89

„ 91^a-91^b = „ 90

„ 92^a-92^b = „ 91

„ 93^a-93^b = „ 92

(ex. verses 17-33)

„ 94^a-95^a = „ 82

(ex. verses 1, 20^a, 23^a, 24 & 26-31)

„ 115^a-115^b = „ 205

(ex. verse 1)

„ 117^a-117^b = „ 207,

10-12

„ 191^b-193^b = „ 53,

3-4 and 11-56

„ 203^a-203^b = „ 290,

2-19

„ 214^a-215^b = chap. 206,

(except the last verse)

(7) *Commentary* *Matsya-P.*

on the *Manu-Smṛti*

(by Kullūkabhaṭṭa)

Under Manu III, 265 = 17, 61

„ „ V, 60 = 18, 30

(8) *Commentary* *Matsya-P.*

on the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti*

(by Aparārka)

p. 16 = 265, 1^b-5

139—(This quotation tal-

lies with *Viṣṇu-P.*

III, 11, 32-35)

145 = 16, 5

201 (twice), 207 (twice) and 209

(twice)—On *ekādaśī*.

Three of the lines quoted

on p. 207 are found quoted

in the *Smṛti-candrikā* IV,

61 as from the *Brahmā-*

śāda-P.

**Com. on Yājñavalkya- Matsya-P.
Smṛti**

295-296, 370, 380-382 and 427—
On gifts of cows, land,
house etc.

301 = chap. 205 (except ver-
se 1).

303-305 = 82, 2-25, (except
verses 12 and 24)

313-319 = chap. 274 (except
verses 3^a, 13^b and 28^b)

320-323 = chap. 275 (ex. the
last verse) and chap.
276 (except the last
verse ; one of the
quoted verses is not
found)

324-326 = chap. 277 (ex. the
last verse)

328-354 = chap. 278, (ex. the
last verse), 279, 280
(ex. the last verse)
281-289,
83-87,
88 (ex. verse 1)
89-91,
92 (ex. the last
verse)

354-356 = chap. 206 (ex. the
first and last verses)

382-383 = 253, 19^b-32

392-396 = chap. 53 (ex. verses
1, 2, 5-10, 21, 25^b-26^a
and 56^b to the end)

403-404 = chap. 290 (ex. ver-
ses 1, 13-17 and 20 to
the end)

409-413 = chap. 58 (ex. verses
1-3)

**Com. on Yājñavalkya- Matsya-P.
Smṛti**

414-415 = chap. 59 (ex. verses
1 and 19)

441 = 16, 11^b-12^a (the other
verse is not found)

443 = 16, 8^b-10^a

456 = 16, 19-20

466-467 = 22, 88

475 (twice) = 15, 34^a and 35^b-
36^a; 16, 26-29
(ex. 26^b)

485 = 17, 26-27^a

491 = 15, 32^b-33^a

507 = 18, 30

511 (twice) = 17, 52^b-55 and 59

512 = 17, 60-61

514 = 16, 56-57^a

515 = 17, 65^b-66

523 = 18, 8-9^a

550 (twice) = 16, 52^b-54^a (the
first quoted pas-
sage is not found)

554 = 17, 36

557-558—One line coincides
with 17, 4^a; the sub-
stance " of another
quoted verse is found
in 17, 2^a

564 = 267, 12^b-13

569 = chap. 94, (the quoted
passage has two verses
more than chap. 94)

572 = 93, 7^b-9^a and 11-12

575 = 93, 59-63^a

800 = 227, 6

835 = 227, 8

856 = 227, 120^b-121^a, and 126^b-
127^a

889 = 18, 5-6

890 = 18, 7

954 = 184, 21^b-23^a

1043 = 227, 118^b-120^a

- (9) *Trikāṇḍa-maṇḍana Matsya-P.*
(of Trikāṇḍa-maṇḍana
Bhāskara Miśra)
p. 238 = 93, 111
- (10) *Haradatta's Matsya-P.*
commentary on the
Gautama-dharma-sūtra
under Gautama II, 5, 12 = 18,
30
- (11) *Kṛtyācāra Matsya-P.*
(of Śrīdatta Upādhyāya)
fol. 66^b = 16, 5^b
- (12) *Kṛtya-ratnākara Matsya-P.*
(of Caṇḍeśvara)
fol. (?) = 61, 43ff.
fol. (?) = 53, 28-29
fol. 139^b = 53, 23-24
„ 161^b-162^a = 56, 1 to end
„ 169^a-170^b = 95 1 to end
„ 176^b = 53, 31-32^b
„ 177^a—(Reference to 82,
18ff in which tila-
dhenṇu-dāna is dealt
with)
„ 178^a = 107, 7-8, (the verse
' sitāsīte etc.' is not
found);
101, 36
„ 181^a = 101, 53^{a-b}
„ 181^a-182^a = 63, 1 to end (ex.
verse 29)
„ 187^a = 53, 33-35
„ 193^a = 101, 79
„ 193^{a-b} = 53, 36-37
„ 197^b = 17, 6-8
„ 220^b ff = 70, 32-44f.
- (13) *Parāśara-bhāṣya Matsya-P.*
(of Mādhavācārya)
Vol. I, part ii.
p. 58 = 18, 30
182 = 184, 21^b-23^a
222 = 18, 30
310 = 17, 4-5
311 = 17, 6-8
361 = 16, 19^a and 19^b-20
371 = 17, 30
398 = 16, 28^b-29^a
396 = 16, 27^b-28^a
405 = 17, 23 and 14^b-15^a
418 = 17, 28^b
433 = 17, 36
434 = 17, 49^b; 16, 47; 17, 53-55
438 = 16, 54^a
440 = 16, 55
443 = 16, 56-57^a
- (14) *Madana-pārijāta Matsya-P.*
(of Madanapāla)
p. 13 = 53, 5^b-13^a (ex. 12^b). One
line ' trptim karoti etc.'
is not found
264 = 101, 37
375 = 184, 21^b-23^a
540 (twice)—(Brahma-P. 220,
53^b-55).
17, 6-8
558 = 16, 11^b-12^a
568 = 16, 27^b-28^a
575 = 17, 23
631 = 17, 65^b-66
(15)
(a) *Vrata-kāla- Matsya-P.*
viveka (of Śūlapāṇi)
fol. 2^b = 93, 140^b-141^a
(b) *Sambandha-viveka*
fol 1^b = 18, 30

(c) *Prāyascitta-vivēka* Matsya-P.p. 416 = 206, 23^b-24^a(16) *Tīrtha-cintāmaṇi* Matsya-P.

(of Vācaspatimiśra)

p. 8 = 106, 3, 4^b-5 and 7

17 = 108, 33

23-24 = 110, 1-11^a (the verse
'tathā dr̥ṣṭvā etc.' is
not found)

26 = 104, 16-17

29-31 = 106, 27-28, 30^b-33 and
46-48; 107, 20-21; 108,
15 and 25-26^a. (Three
verses are not found)27-29 = 107, 8 (the other quo-
ted verses are not found)47 = 104, 5-6^a

48-49 = 106, 34-39

49 = 106, 40-42

49 = 106, 44-45

49-50 = 107, 4-6 (ex. 5c)

50 = 107, 9-11

50 = 107, 17-19

42-43 = 105, 13^b-14^a and 16
-end45 = 105, 13^b-15

200 = 104, 14

205 = 106, 49^a216 = 106, 49 (the other three
lines as not found)236 = 82, 2-6 and 7-25 (except
verses 23^a and 24)267 = 105, 15 (the other ver-
ses are not found)

340 = 183, 61-62

342 = 180, 54 and 57^a (one line
is not found);184, 56-57^a (one verse
is not found)345 = 182, 27^a-^b*Tīrtha-cintāmaṇi* Matsya-P.

349 = 183, 71-72 and 75

351 = 183, 73

(17) *Nityācāra-* Matsya-P.
paddhati

(of Vidyākara Vājapecyin)

p. 127 = 182, 12^b530 = 158, 13^a

(18)

(a) *Dāna-kriyā-* Matsya-P.
kaumudī (of Govindānanda)p. 24 (twice) = 18, 8^b;56 = 205, 4^b-653, 17^a-^b.70 (thrice) = 53, 51 53, 17^a-^b,
22^a-^b, and 5181 = 206 (ex. verses 1, 3-4^a, 9^a,
10-19, 20^b-22, 23^b-28^a,
and 30-31)84 = 206, 23^b-24^a86 = 18, 12^b-14^a94 (twice) = 207, 18-19^a;
207, 38100 = 18, 16^b

125 = 58, 55-56

130 = 58, 18^a-^b157 = 58, 42^b-43161 = 17, 65^b164 = 58, 43^b(b) *Śuddhi-kriyā-kaumudī*

p. 49 = 18, 30

74 = 18, 12^b139 = 18, 7^a163 = 18, 12^b-14^a

165 = 207, 38-41

169 = 207, 18-19^a

177 = 17, 70

178 = 18, 26

182 = 18, 16^a and 22^b-23^a

<i>Śuddhi-kriyā- kaumudī</i>	<i>Mātṣya-P.</i>	<i>Śrāddha-kriyā- kaumudī</i>	<i>Mātṣya-P.</i>
183 = 18, 22 ^b -23 ^a		192 = 16, 39 ^a	
184 = 18, 16		194 = 16, 38 ^b -39	
194 = 22, 82-84 ^a		196 = 17, 47 ^b and 49 ^a	
284 = 274, 6 ^b -10		207 = 17, 52 ^b -55 ^a	
350 = 102, 31		208 = 17, 55 ^a	
(c) <i>Śrāddha-kriyā-kaumudī</i>		212 = 17, 52 ^a and 23	
p. 11 = 17, 30-36		214 = 17, 59-60 ^a	
27 = 17, 63-64		252 = 16, 57 ^b -58 ^a	
28 = 17, 70		259 of 17, 63 ^a	
32 = 17, 70		300 = 18, 22 ^b -23 ^a	
35 = 16, 8-12 (six lines, 'śad- aṅgavit etc.' are not found)		306 = 22, 82-85	
41 = 16, 14 and 15 ^b -16, (the line 'parapūrvāpatih etc.' and the verse, 'Karpātās-ca etc.' are not found)		312-313 = 22, 2	
59 = 17, 14 ^a		319 = 18, 16	
81 = 16, 20		326 = 16, 43	
84 = 16, 19 ^a and 29 ^b -30 ^a		336 = 18, 8 ^b -9 ^a	
98 = 16, 56-57 ^a		337 = 18, 22 ^b -23 ^a	
103 = 184, 33 ^a ;		345-346 = 18, 22 ^b -23 ^a	
17, 11 ^b -12 ^a ;		357 = 18, 16	
16, 27 ^b -29 ^a		362 = 18, 16 ^a	
122 = 17, 16 ^b		389 = 17, 27 ^a	
126 = 17, 19 ^b -23		398 = 18, 26	
127 = 17, 14 ^b -15 ^a		425 = 18, 19 ^b -22 ^a	
128 = 17, 14 ^b -15 ^a and 17 ^b		433-434 = 18, 16	
137 = 17, 26 ^b -27 ^a		435 = 18, 28-29	
142 = 15, 37 ^b -38 ^a		436 = 18, 20 ^a and 21 ^b	
150 = 15, 32 ^b -33 ^a		471 = 16, 58 ^b -c.	
186 = 17, 46		474 = 18, 23 ^a	
		488 = 17, 65 ^b -66	
		557 = 16, 5 ^b	
		(19) <i>Nityācāra-pradīpa Mātṣya-P.</i> (of Nṛsiṃha Vājapeyīn)	
		p. 18 = 53, 59 ^b -c	
		104 = 18, 30	
		209 = 93, 83 ^b -84 ^a	

The following editions of the Purāṇas and other works have been used in this paper.

Matsya-Purāṇa—Vaṅgavāsī edition.

Vāyu-Purāṇa—Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series ed.

Brahmāṇḍa-P.—Venkaṭeśvara Press ed.

Padma-P.—(sṛṣṭi-khaṇḍa)—Vaṅgavāsī ed.

Harivamśa—Vaṅgavāsī ed.

Mahābhārata—Calcutta and Bombay editions

Kūrma-P.—Vaṅga. ed.

Mārkaṇḍeya-P.—Vaṅga. ed.

Viṣṇu-P.—Vaṅga. ed.

Brahma-P.—Vaṅga. ed.

Bṛhat-saṃhitā—Ed. by Kern.

Jyāyāśa-saṃhitā—Ed. by Erbar Krishnamacharya, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Vol. LIV.

Ahīrbudhanya-saṃhitā—Published by the Adyar Library, Adyar, Madras

Bhāgavata-P.—Vaṅga. ed.

Bhaviṣya-P.—Venkaṭ. Press ed.

Viṣṇu-dharmottara—Venkaṭ. Press ed.

Liṅga-P.—Edited by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta.

Smṛti-candrikā—Pub. by the Govt. of Mysore.

Prāyaścitta-prakaraṇa—Pub. by the Sanskrit Sāhitya Parishad, Calcutta.

Kāla-viveka—Bibl. Ind. ed.

Hāratalā—Bibl. Ind. ed.

Dāna-sāgara—India Office Ms.

Adbhuta-sāgara—Ed. by Muralidhara Jha. (Benares)

Aparārka's commentary on Yāj.—AnSS ed.

Kullukabhaṭṭa's commentary on the Manusmṛti—Vaṅga. ed.

Mitākṣarā on Yāj.—Nirṇaya-sāgara Press ed.

Trikaṇḍa-maṇḍana—Bibl. Ind. ed.

Haradatta's com. on Gautama-dharma-sūtra—AnSS. ed.

Kṛtyāśāstra—Ms. No. M 42/39 in the Dacca University Library.

Kṛtya-ratnākara—A mutilated Ms. (No. 1055c) in the Dacca University Library.

Parāśara-bhāṣya of Mādhavācārya—Ed. by V. S. Islampurkar.

Madana-pārijāta—Bibl. Ind. ed.

Vrata-kāla-viveka—Ms. (No. 1578c) in the Dacca University Library.

Sambandha-viveka—Ms No. 403 c. in the D. U. L.

Prāyaścitta-viveka—Ed. by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara.

Tīrtha-cintāmaṇi—Bibl. Ind. ed.

Nityāśāstra-paddhati—Bibl. Ind. ed.

Dāna-kriyā-kaumudī, Suddhi-kriyā-kaumudī, Śrāddha-kriyā-kaumudī—
— Bibl. Ind. eds.

Nityāśāstra-pradīpa—Bibl. Ind. ed.

मत्तकरिणीवि एवं सिहिसरपाएसु ढंमि जइ तगणो ।

पयासिं मत्ताईण संकरो होइ बहुरूवा ॥ ३ ॥

आसामुदाहरणानि ग्रन्थान्तराज्ज्ञेयानि ॥ २७ ॥ २८ ॥ पञ्चपदीप्रकरणम् ।-

अथ षट्पदी—

दसअट्टतेरसाहि वा इह बारसअट्टतेरसहिं अहवा ।

अट्टेगारसांह व दसः पकारसांह वावि ॥ २९ ॥

बारसअट्टेगारसहिं वा रविवसुरवीहिं य कलाहिं ।

तिमु तिसु पएसु कमसो दलजुयले बहुविहा घत्ता ॥ ३० ॥

पसा कडवयनिहणे छड्डणिग्या इत्थ पढमबिहुयाण ।

तइयच्छट्ठाण चउत्थपंचमाणं च अणुपासो ॥ ३१ ॥

[दशाष्टत्रयोदशभिर्वा इह द्वादशाष्टत्रयोदशभिरथवा ।

अष्टाष्टैकादशभिर्वा दशाष्टत्रयोदशभिर्वापि ॥ २९ ॥

द्वादशाष्टैकादशभिर्वा रविवसुरविभिर्वा कलाभिः ।

त्रिषु त्रिषु पदेषु क्रमशो दलयुगले बहुविधा घत्ता ॥ ३० ॥

एषा कडवकनिधने छड्डणिकात्र प्रथमद्वितीययोः ।

तृतीयचतुर्थोऽथतुर्थपञ्चमयोश्चानुप्रासः ॥ ३१ ॥

इहास्ति अस्मिच्छन्दसि दशाष्टत्रयोदशादिकला यथासंख्यकृमत्रिपाद-
घटितार्थद्वया बहुविधा घत्तानाम षट्पदी । वक्ष्यमाणस्य संधेर्मुखे कडवकस्य त्वन्ते
ध्रुवमियं कार्यैव । ध्रुवा ध्रुवकमिति संज्ञाद्वयापि एषा कडवकान्ते प्रक्रान्तार्थस्य
भङ्गयन्तरेणाभिधाने छड्डणिकेति तुर्यनामापि । इत्थत्ति अस्यां घत्तायां प्रथम-
द्वितीययोस्तृतीयचतुर्थोऽथतुर्थपञ्चमयोः पादयोरनुप्रासः ॥

उदा०—माणिमाणसमुद्धय । बप्पुढमहय (मुद्धय) । जे जिणिंद लुह नहु णमिय ।

दुहसंघत्ताविय । कुसमयभावि । ते नर निरु भवि चिरु भमिय ॥ ४६ ॥

[मनसि मानसमुद्धताः । मूर्खा वराकाः । ये जिनेन्द्र त्वां न प्रणताः ॥

दुःखसंघतापिताः । कुसमयभाविताः । ते नराः खलु भवे चिरं

भ्रान्ताः ॥ ४६ ॥]

संघत्तावियात्ति समासे वेति द्वित्वम् । बप्पुहुत्ति शीघ्रादिस्वाह्वराकस्य बप्पुढः ।
निरुत्ति निश्चयार्थेव्ययम् ॥ ४६ ॥

उदा०—जय जिणिसासणनंदण- । वणहरियंदण । निम्मलजसचंदणमलय ।

गुरुकुलमयणदिवायर । गुणमणिसायर । तिलयसूरि गण रतिलय ॥ ४७ ॥

महिभरसेसह । भीमनरेसह । जउ वज्जिय जयदह ।

तउ रिडवग्गह । भयभरभग्गह । हियदह पडिय भसह ॥ ४८ ॥

भग्गउ अडयारिं । इहपहारिहिं । समरि सयंभरिराउ ।

घणरणकुड्डालह । कुमरप्पालह । तिणि माणि भग्गउ बिताउ ॥ ४९ ॥

[जयजिनशासननन्दन-। वनहरिचन्दन । निर्मलयशश्वन्दनमलय ॥
गुरुकुलगगनदिवाकर । गुणमणिसागर । तिलकसूरे गणधरतिलक ॥४७॥
महीभरशेषस्य । भमिनरेशस्य । यदा वायते जयदङ्का ॥
तदा रिपुवर्गस्य भयभरभग्नस्य । हृदयं पतिता भीतिः ॥ ४८ ॥
भग्नोत्तिचारिभि- । रेकप्रहारेण । समरे शाकंभरीराजः ।
घणरणकौतुकवतः । कुमारपालस्य । तेन मनसि भक्तो विषादः (?)॥४९॥
कुडालहसि । शीघ्रादित्वात् । कौतुकस्य कुडं तत आलश्व ॥ ४९ ॥

उदा०—दलि महियलु रिहंतह । तुह चहंतह । दीसहि जय जयवीर ।
कट्ट अमित्तह चित्तिहिं । तिण पुण दंतिहिं । गेहिणिनयणिहिं नीर ॥५०॥*
[दलेन महीतलमलंकुर्वाणस्य । तत्र चलतः । दृश्यते । जय जगद्दीर ॥
कष्टा अमित्राणां चित्ते । तृणं पुनर्दन्ते । गृहिणीनयनेषु च नीरम् ॥५०॥]

कट्टति काष्ठानि कष्टानि च ।
उदा०—दीसहि सुंद गयाणणि । कव्वइ कइयणि । जूयचडण सिरि निम्भर ।
मारण जइ-परि पारइ । रज्जि तहारइ । कुमरनरिंद किवायर ॥ ५१॥*
[दृश्यते शुण्डा गजानने । काव्यानि कविजने । यूकापतनं शिरसि
निर्भरम् ॥

मारणं यतिपरिवारे (?) । राज्ये तव । कुमारनरेन्द्र कृपाकर ॥ ५१ ॥]

सुंदति मदिराः करिकराश्च । कव्वत्ति कव्यानि काव्यानि च यूतपतनानि
यूकापतनानि च ॥ दिक्मात्रमिदं घत्ताषट्कम् । यतः सप्तकलायैः सप्तकलान्तैः पादै-
स्तुल्यैस्तुल्यैर्वा त्रिभिस्त्रिभिर्बन्धार्थद्वयानेकधा विदग्धगोष्ठीगरिष्ठा घत्ता । किञ्च
दृतीयाद्याः दशदशयो मात्रा एकैकवृत्त्या यावत्सप्तदशः शेषाद्भिन्नचतुष्के तु सप्तैव
यत्र सा षट्पदी । दशादीनां सप्तदशान्तानामष्टविधत्वादष्टधा ।
सप्तस्थाने अष्टमात्राश्चेत्तदा सैवोपजातिर्नाम षट्पदी पूर्ववदष्टधा । अष्टस्थाने नव
चेत् तदावजातिर्नाम षट्पदी प्राग्वदष्टधा । एवं षट्पदजात्युपजात्यवजातीनां
प्रत्येकमष्टविधत्वाच्चतुर्विंशतिधा षट्पदी । यद्वोचंच्छब्दः कन्वल्याम्—

जीइ कलाउ दसाई सत्तरसंता य सिहिरसपपसु ।
सेसेसु सत्त छपई सा छपई नाम अट्टविहा ॥ १ ॥
इय अट्टहि उवजाई सत्तट्टाणे कलाहि अट्टविहा ।
नवहि पुणो अवजाई एवं चउवीसहा छपई ॥ २ ॥

चतुष्पदीद्विपद्यावपि ध्रुवाः वक्थसांसंज्ञे ज्ञेये । ते आप संधिमुखे कडवकान्ते
ध्रुवं...कार्यं । केवलं कडवकान्ते चतुष्पद्येव छड्डुणिकास्या न द्विपदी । यच्छब्दः-
कन्वली—

कडवयनिवहो संधी पट्टाडियाईहिं चडहिं पुण कडवं ।
संधिमुहे कडवंते धुवाच धुवरं च घत्ता वा ॥ १ ॥
सा तिबिहा छपई चडपई य दुपई य तासु पुण दुक्कि ।
इ चउपपईउ कडवयनिहणे छ णियनामावि ॥ २ ॥

तथान्तरसमार्धसमा संकीर्णा सर्वसमा चेति चतुर्धा चतुःपदी । यच्छन्दःकन्दली -
 अह चउपर्यङ् चउङ्गा हवन्ति अन्तरसमा तहन्दसमा ।
 संकिञ्जा सव्वसमा य तामु तावन्तरसमाओ ॥ १ ॥
 विसमे सेगा सेगा सत्ताई सोल जाव पत्तेयं ।
 अट्ठाई जा सतरस सेगा सेगा समे मत्ता ॥ २ ॥
 चंपङ्कुसुमाईनामियाओ जाईव हुंति पणपञ्चा ।
 दिसिगहवसुःयरससरसायरसिंहिनयणचंदभेएहिं ॥ ३ ॥
 एयाउच्चिय सुमणोरमाइनामाउ वच्चए मुणह ।
 एवं दहुत्तरसयं चउप्पई अंतरसमाओ ॥ ४ ॥
 अंतरसमयाच्चिय दुइयतइयपायाण विणिमयंमि कए
 अद्धसमा य दहुत्तरसयसंखा तेहिं नामेहिं ॥ ५ ॥
 दुहितिहिचउहिवि विसरिसपाएहि विमिस्सियाउ संकिञ्जा ।
 सव्वसमाउ पुण सरिसएहिं सव्वेहिं पाएहिं ॥ ६ ॥

कुङ्कुमाया तु चतुःषष्टिधा द्विपदी । तयोः पञ्चाननललितामलयमारुतक-
 दोहकापदोहकायाः कतिचिदन्तरसमाचतुष्पदीभेदा कुङ्कुमायाश्च कतिचिद्विपदी-
 भेदाः प्रायुक्ता एव पञ्चाननललिता च बहुशः संधिमुखेषु प्रयुक्ता दृश्यते ॥ २९ ॥
 ३० ॥ ३१ ॥

पपका टवुगं पपटा क्रमेण मुहणिहणदलपयतिगेसु ।
 कितिधवलं दलजुगे पढमतइज्जाणमणुपासो ॥ ३२ ॥
 [पपकाटवुगं पपटाः क्रमेण मुखनिधनदलपदत्रिके ।
 कीर्तिधवलं दलयुगे प्रथमतृतीययोरनुप्रासः ॥ ३२ ॥]

धवलव्याजायेनच्छन्दसा पुमाद् वर्ण्यते तद्धवलम् । तच्च त्रिधा । अष्टपात्
 षट्पाच्चतुष्पात् । यदाह—

धवलनिहेण सुपुरिसा वसिज्जइ जेण तेण सो धवल्लो ।
 धवल्लोवि होइ तिविहो अट्ठपउच्छप्पउ चउउप्पाओ ॥

तत्राष्टपदश्रीधवलमष्टपद्यां वक्ष्यति । षट्पदस्तु अयं यथा । क्रमान्मुखदले
 प्रथमेऽङ्गौ द्वौ षण्मात्रवेको द्विमात्रो त्रितीयाङ्गौ तु द्वौ चतुर्मात्रौ तृतीये तु द्वौ
 षण्मात्रावेकंश्चतुर्मात्रः । एवं द्वितीयदलाङ्घ्रिभ्रत्रयेपि यस्य तत्कीर्तिधवलं छन्दः ।
 दलद्वयेऽप्यस्य प्रत्येकं आयतृतीयपादयोरनुप्रासः ॥

उदा०—देसनगुणगव्विहिं गज्जड । मज्जच्च नाणिहिं । पवलवायभडवाइहिं

भज्जउ ।

परिकिसिधवा देयसयलधर । जसवोससूरि । तुहसमवड न लहहि

किञ्चि गणधर ॥ ५२ ॥

6 [Annals, B. O. R. I.]

सूरिलच्छिमणिहारफुरियकिरणुक्करसुंदर
 मुहमणहरहरिणकबिंबजुण्हाभरसोयर ।
 वयणकुहरविहरंतवाणिदेहच्छविबिभ्रमु
 सच्छप्पयनहनिवहबहलउम्मुहमोहोवमु
 समक्षीरजलहिलहरीलडहु कितिकणइकुसुमप्पवर ।
 मह शुरुहु तुहु दीसइ कटरि देसणखणि दसणंसुभरं ॥ ५४ ॥

[प्रेक्षस्व प्रदोषे पिहितसमग्रगनाङ्गणमार्गस्य
 गम्भीरमध्यमुह्यलोकलोचनोत्सवाग्रस्य (?) ।
 तत्कालेऽप्येवमिदं किन्तु निर्मलमणिवृन्दस्य
 ब्रह्मप्रतमतिमिरनिकरोद्दामसमुद्रस्य ॥
 शशिखण्डं लहरिहेलोलसनशीलविकटशुक्तिसंपुटसमम् ।
 प्रसृताक्षि तरलतारकनिवहो ज्ञायते घनः फेनोद्गमः ॥ ५३ ॥

सूरिलक्ष्मीमणिहारस्फुरितकिरणोत्करमुन्दरो
 मुखमनोहरहरिणाङ्कबिम्बज्योत्स्नाभरसोदरः ।
 वदनकुहरविहरद्वाणीदेहच्छाविविभ्रमः
 स्वच्छपदनखनिवहबहलोन्मुखमयूखोपमः ॥

शमक्षीरजलधिलहरीलटभः कीर्तिलताकुसुमं प्रवरम् ।

मम गुरोस्तव दृश्यते भो देशनासमये दशनांशुभरः ॥ ५४ ॥]

सच्छप्पयेत्यादि । स्वच्छपदनखनिवहबहलोन्मुखमयूखोपमम् । 'नवामयू-
 खलवणचतुर्गुणचतुर्थचतुर्दशचतुर्वारसुकुमारकुतूहलोद्मुखलोलूखले' (हे० ८-१-१७१)
 इति आदिस्वरस्य सस्वरव्यञ्जेनेन सह ओकारः । कणयत्ति लता । तुहुत्ति तुहुश्च
 प्राग्वद् कटरित्ति विस्मये ॥ ५४ ॥

रासावलयस्य कुङ्कुमेन यथा—

जयरि झलक्कहिं नयण दहिनयणिआहि त खणु
 केअइकुसुमदलग्गि भसलु धिलसइ तजणु ।
 जइ य तीइ मुहहावि मंदहासड चडइ
 ता जणु हीरइपोमरायसचंड झडइ ॥

जइ तीइ महुमियभासणिहि वयणंमुंफु निसुणिज्जइ ।

ता धुउ करिप्पि जणु अमयसु कल्लपल्लपुडि पिज्जइ ॥ ४८ ॥

रासावलयस्य कर्पूरेण यथा—

परहुयपंचमसवणसभय मसठ स किरि
 तिभाणि भणइ न किं पि मुद्धि कलयंठिगिरि ।
 चंदु न दिखण सक्कइ जं सा ससिबयणि
 दप्पणि मुइ न पल्लोअइ तिभाणि मयनयणि ॥

जह तुहुं महु करयलु उम्मोडिवि
चलिय श्रीरंचलु अरुछोडिवि ।

भाणिणि तुवि पसाउ करि मुम्मड
 पइ पिइ उत्तावलिउ म गम्मड ॥
 जइ किंवावि संवह पयजुयलु इह विहिवसिण विहड्डइ ।
 ता तुज्झ मज्झु खीणउ खरउ किं म खामोअरि तुट्टइ ॥ ५४ ॥

कपूर्णेण यथा—

किं न फुल्लइ पाडल परपरिमल
 महमहेइ किं न माहवि अविरल ।
 नवमालिय किं न वलइ पड्डिलिय
 किं न उत्थरइ कुसुमभरि मल्लिय ॥
 विहितल।यसरितल्लडहिं किं न पसाहि पउमिणि फुड्डइ ।
 तुवि जाइ जायगुणसंभरणुग्गाणु वि भसल हु मणि खुड्डइ ॥ ५५ ॥
 षट्पदीप्रकरणम् । अथ सप्तपदी । अथ मात्राजातिरुल्लालकाभ्यां
 कुक्कुमकपूर्वाभ्यां संगता फुल्लसंज्ञा । यन्मनोरथः—

जइ मत्ताजाईणं उल्लाला हेट्ठयंमि दीसंति ।
 ता ताईं सव्वाईं फुल्लयनामेण कहियाईं ॥ १ ॥
 उदा०—विहियभरवइसवइघरदास । रसु साहिउ दुद्धरिसु ।
 हणिउ असुर वद्धरु भयंकरु ॥
 छहरिसणविट्ठसम । खत्तिरज्झ पालिउ निरंवरु ॥
 पूइयकइंदवंदिण विबुहवरसुरकित्तणकारिय ।
 जयसिंहदेवराइहिं भुवणि कित्तिरिद्धि वद्धारिय ॥ ५५ ॥
 रामपंडवभरहहरियंद । णलपमुहिहिं जण—। पुत्तभावु पावेअहिं कूरिहि ।
 विलवंतह नियजणह । जकिर हरिउ पत्थिविहिं भूरिहि ॥
 मुग्गदु तमुक्क पई पाउ भाणि तिणु जिव तिहुणप्पालसुय ।
 उप्पुल्लवयण किन जण मुणाहि, तिणि कुमरेस चरित्त तुय ॥ ५६ ॥

[* * * * * ॥५५॥
 रामपाण्डवभरतहरिश्चन्द्र— । नलप्रमुखैर्जन— । पुत्रभावं प्रतिपद्य क्रूरैः ॥
 विलपतो निजजनस्य । यत्किल हतं पार्थिवैर्भूरिभिः ॥
 मृतस्त्वं तन्मुक्तं 'स्वयं प्राप्नोतु' भणित्वा तृणमिव त्रिभुवनपालित ।
 उत्फुल्लवदनः किं न जानाति जनस्तेन कुमरेश चरित्रं तव ॥ ५६ ॥]

पडिबज्जिज्जि प्रतिपद्य । मुग्गदुत्ति मृतस्वम् । भणित्ति भणित्वा । 'कस्वा-इ-
 इउ-इवि अवय' (हे० ८-४-४३९) इति त्वास्थाने इः । एवं शेषभेदेदुदाहार्यम् ।
 सप्तपदीप्रकरणम् ।

अथाष्टपदी—

विसमेसु टातिगकेहिं समेसु टदुगेण चउसु सिरिधवलं ।

विसमसमपयणुपासं, अह तरलं दोहसंदोहा ॥ ३४ ॥

[विषमेषु टात्रिककैः समेषु टाद्विकेन चतुर्षु श्रीधवलम् ।

विषमसमपादानुप्रासं; अथ तरलं दोहसंदोही ॥ ३४ ॥]

विषमेषु चतुर्षु पादेषु त्रिभिश्चतुर्मात्रैरेकेन द्विमात्रेण समेषु चतुर्षु पादेषु द्वाभ्यां चतुर्मात्राभ्यां श्रीधवलं छन्दो विषमसमपादानुप्रासं प्रथमस्याङ्गप्रेर्वितीयनाङ्गत्रिणा तृतीयस्य तुर्येण पञ्चमस्य षष्ठेन सप्तमस्याष्टमेनानुप्रास इत्यर्थः । अथ दोहसंदोही मिलितौ तरलं छन्दः । दोहशब्देनेह दोहकजातिर्गृह्यते ततो दोहकावदोहकोपदोहकोद्दोहकादीनां संग्रहः । यन्मनोरथः—

“ जइ दोहयाण हिठ्ठे दीसइ संदोहओ हहं (?) रइओ ।

ता ते सब्बे छंदंमि तरलनामेण नायव्वा ॥ १ ॥ ”

उदा०—क्षीरसमुद्दिण लवणजलहि । कुवलय कुमुदहिं ।

कालिंदी सुरसिंधुजलिण । महमहुणु हरिण ॥

कइलासिण सरिसउ हू किरि । सो अंजणगिरि ।

इह तुह जससिरिधवलउ पहु । किं पंडरु न हु ॥ ५७ ॥

सिरिधवलं हेमसूरस्ति ।

धणु जुव्वणु जीविउ सयलु । चंचलु जिम्ब करिकु ॥

स्वणि स्वणि करयालि नीरु जिम्ब । गलइ रूवलायकु ॥

अवरइ अविरलविज्जुलवलय- । विलसिततरल पयत्थ ।

तुह बड धन्तु ज्जमसाढिलमण । जण अरुइ वीसत्थ ॥ ५८ ॥

[क्षीरसमुद्गेण लवणजलाधिः । कुवलयानि कुमुदैः ।

कालिन्दी सुरसिन्धुजलेन । मधुमथनो हरेण ॥

कैलासेन सदृशः खलु कृतः । सोऽननगिरिः ॥

इह तव यशःश्रीधवलितं प्रभो । किं पाण्डुरं न खलु ? ॥ ५७ ॥

धनं यौवनं जीवितं सकलं । चञ्चलं यथा करिकर्णः ॥

क्षणे क्षणे करतले नीरं यथा । गलति रूपलावण्यम् ॥

अपरमपि अविरलविज्जुलवलय- । विलसिततरलाः पदार्थाः ॥

ततोपि सुढो धन्तुज्जमसाढिलमनाः । जनो भवति विश्वस्तः ॥ ५८ ॥]

बडति शीघ्रादौ मूढस्य नालियबडावीति । (हे. ८-४-४२२.)

वन्धुय दोहा दोहय वन्धुवया तहय दुवइगीईओ ।

हुंति दुहंमी नामा वन्धू दोहाइजुयमत्ता ॥ ३५ ॥

[वस्तु च दोहा, दोहा च वस्तुवदनं; तथा च िपदीमीत्या ।

भवान्ति द्विमङ्गी नाम, वस्तु दोहादियुतमात्रा ॥ ३५ ॥]

वस्थुन्ति । वस्थुवशन्ति वस्तुवदनं तदुपरि तदादौ च दोहकस्तथा च द्विपयुपरि
गीतिर्द्विभङ्गीसङ्गाः स्युः । द्वौ भङ्गौ छन्दसी यस्यामिति द्विभङ्गी ।

उदा०—अरिरि मयण रवयणकमलदंसणु रवणु वज्जह
अरिरि कालपरिवाससिद्धिलबन्धणु धणु सज्जह ।
अरिरि वीरहरिणकचूडलूढणु सरु संधह
अरिरि हठिण उज्जिति जंतु मह बल्लहु रंधह ॥
इम्ब बुल्लंती राइमइ । सामिय बहुसोहग्ग ।

अंसुजल्लूयलोयणिय । तुह किम्ब चित्ति न लग्ग ॥ ५९ ॥

दुहंमिया सूरप्पहसूरिस्स ।

मइं मिल्लिउ मन जाह तुह । कंत वसंतपवेसि ।
चूउ न वाहह उत्थरिउ । विरहिणिमारणरेसि ॥
विरहिणिमारणरेसिं गुंदिसच्चाहु सुदिदु करि
किन बाहह उत्थरिउ चूउ अविरलदलडवरि ।
कंत वसंतपवेसि विरहदुहधंघलि घल्लिउ
अहह म जाह अणाहदीणदुम्मइ मइ मिल्लिउ ॥ ६० ॥

[अरेरे मदन रतिवदनकमलदर्शनं क्षणं वर्जय
अरेरे कालपरिवासशिथिलबन्धनं धनुः सज्जय ।
अरेरे वीरहरिणाङ्कचूडालोढनं शरं संधेहि
अरेरे हठेनोज्जयन्तं गच्छन्तं मम बल्लभं रुधान ॥
इति वदन्ती राजीमतिः । स्वामिन् बहुसौभाग्या ।
अञ्जुलार्द्रलोचनी । तव किं चित्ते न लग्ना ॥ ५९ ॥]

[मां त्यक्त्वा मा यासीस्त्वं । कान्त वसन्तप्रवेशे ।
चतो न बाहुभिरास्तीर्णो । विरहिणीमारणार्थम् ? ॥
विरहिणीमारणार्थं मञ्जरीसच्चाहं सुदृढं कृत्वा
किं न बाहुभिरास्तीर्णश्चूतोऽविरलदलभरेण ? ।
कान्त वसन्तप्रवेशे विरहदुःखमोहे क्षिप्त्वा
अहह मा याहि अनाथदीनदुर्मतिं मां त्यक्त्वा ॥ ६० ॥]

गुंदित्ति मंजिरी । धंघलित्ति शीघ्रादौ लगटकस्य धंघलः । अत्राम्मायः ।

दोहकपदानि प्रतिलोमं वस्तुवदनरूपेणोपार्तयानि ।

उदा०—घरि घरि धेणुदोहहहिमंथविलोढणघोसुं मुम्मए
वंस्सणवेयपढणज्झुणि वंदिण जयजयसहु मुम्मए ।
तक्खणि मुसु कहावि निहालसु कामुयजणुवि बुज्जए
धारणिबांधि जित्थु नारीयाणि अविरलु सल्लिहु बुज्जए ॥

सा बहलकमलपरिमलमिलितरोलंबरोलरमणीया ।
मंगलनिवहाबंशा दिणमुहसंज्ञा नरिंद तुह होउ ॥ ६१ ॥

[गृहेगृहे धेनुदोहदधिमन्थविलोडणघोषो घूर्णते
व्याख्यानवेदपठणध्वनिर्वन्दीनां जयजयशब्दः श्रूयन्ते ।
तत्क्षणे मुक्तः कथमपि निद्रालसः कामुकजनोपि बोध्यते
धारणिबन्धे यत्र नारीजनेनाविरलं सलिलमुह्यते ॥
सा बहलकमलपरिमलमिलितरोलंबरोलरमणीया ।

मङ्गलनिवहावन्ध्या दिनमुखसंघ्या नरेन्द्र तवास्तु ॥ ६१ ॥

रोलम्बरोलुत्ति भ्रमररवः । तथा चेति चकारादन्यैरपि छन्दोभिर्द्वन्द्वितै-
र्द्विभङ्गी स्यात् । यथा गाथाया भद्रिकायोगे—

केलिकर्षभा ऊरू नाही वावी मुणालिया बाहा ।
नयणाई कुवल्याई दसणा उण कुंदकलियाओ ॥
छण ससिमंडलमाणणं पाणीपाया य तुज्ज पउमाई ।
सिसिरोवयारमइयासि किं तहवि दिवाणिंसं दहोसि दइए ॥५६॥

[कदलीस्तम्भावूरू; नाभिर्वापी; मृणालिके बाहू ।
नयने कुवलये; दशनाः पुनः कुन्दकलिकाः ॥
क्षणशशिमण्डलमाननं पाणी पादौ च तव पद्मानि ।
शिशिरोपचारमय्यासि किं तथापि दिवानिशं दहसि दयिते ॥५६॥]

अष्टपदी ॥ अथ नवपदी । दोहकादियुता मात्राजातिर्वस्तुसंज्ञा ।
रुच्येत्यन्ये । आदिशब्दादवदोहकोपदोहकपरिग्रहः ।

उदा०—पुव्वपव्वयरायसियछत्तु । तमकुंजरपंचमुहु । रयणिरमाणि-
माणिक्कदप्पणु ।

नहकमलाकरकमलु । अमयकलसु जगदाहसंपणु ॥
संभुजटालयणीकुसुमु । कंदप्पहुमकंदु ।

सयलवत्थुअत्थिक्ककरु । तो उम्मिल्लइ चंदु ॥ ६२ ॥

[पूर्वपर्वतराजसितच्छत्रं । तमःकुंजरपञ्चमुखो । रजनिरमणी-
माणिक्यदर्पणः ॥

नभःकमलाकरकमलं । अमृतकलशो जगदाहशामकः ॥
संभुजटालताकुसुमं । कन्दर्पद्रुमकन्दः ॥
सकलवस्तुस्तिक्यकरः । तत उन्मिलति चन्द्रः ॥ ६२ ॥

लयाणीति लता । अत्रोपपत्तिरप्युदाहार्यम् । नवपदं नवपदम् ।
अथ दशपदी ।

दोहय घत्ताउ दुहंगिया; अहल्लालसंजुया वत्थू ।
 होइ तिहंगी; अह खंडजुयलमीई दुवइखंड ॥ ३६ ॥
 [दोहा च घत्ता द्विभङ्गी; अथोल्लालसंजुता वस्तु; ।
 भवति त्रिभङ्गी; अथ खण्डयुगलं गीतिश्च द्विपदीखण्डम् ॥ ३६ ॥]
 दोहकजात्यन्ते घत्ताजातिरेवमपि द्विभङ्गी ।
 उदा०—को नेसइ संदेसडा । सहि देसडाति वूरि ॥
 बंदिमुहि पडइ संठविउ । गुरु सूरप्पहसूरि ॥
 इम्ब गुट्टिद्विय । गुरु उक्कंठिया । अविरल रहमुत्ताल ।
 छल्लइ रंगिहिं । नवनवभंगिहिं । माल(व)देसीवाल ॥ ६३ ॥
 दुहंगी तिलयसूरिस्य ।

[को नेष्यति संदेशं । स हि देशोति दूरे ॥

* * । गुरुः सूरप्रभसूरिः ॥

इति गोष्ठीस्थितः । गुरुत्कण्ठितः । * * *

* * । * * ॥ ६३ ॥]

द्विभङ्गी तिलकसूरेः ॥

दशपदीप्रकरणम् । अथैकादशपदी । अथोल्लालकाभ्यां संजुता वत्थुत्ति वस्तु-
 जातित्रिभङ्गी भवति । त्रयो भङ्गाश्छन्दस्त्रयरूपा अस्यां सा त्रिभङ्गी ।

उदा०—गहिर जलहरमुरव वण्णांति । घणु नच्चहि विण्जुलिय ।

महुर मोर गायंति सुस्तर ।

दहुररव घच्चरिय । रुण्णुणंति घणघोसनिम्बर ॥

वप्पीहयबंदिणावि सर । लच्छावसर रसंति ।

जलधाराधोरणिमिसिण । वायण पयढ पढंति ॥

इम्ब निम्बर बट्टइ धरवलइ सयलल पयलल पणउ ॥

सहरिसअणंगनिवसच्चविउ अहिणवु पाउसपिण पणउ ॥ ६४ ॥

[गम्भीरा जलधरमुरजा वायन्ते । बहु नृत्यति विपुत् ।

मधुरं मयूरा गायन्ति सुस्वरम् ॥

दधुररवचर्परिकाः । रुण्णुणन्ति घनघोषनिर्भराः ॥

चातकबन्दीनामपि स्वराः । लच्छावसरा रसन्ति ॥

जलधाराधोरणिमिषेण । वायनानि प्रकटं पतन्ति ॥

इति निर्भरं वर्तते धरावलये सकललोक..... ।

सहर्षानङ्गनूपट्टमभिनवं प्राबुदप्रेक्षणकम् ॥ ६४ ॥]

एकादशपदीप्रकरणम् । अथ द्वादशपदी । खण्डमलान्ते गीतिः सामान्येन
 त्रिभङ्गी विशेषेण द्विपदीखण्डम् ।

उदा०—*सुखमयि* । मउलाविंतो चूययं ।

सिदिलियमाणग्गहणउ । वायइ दाहिणपवणउ ॥

वियलियबउलामेलओ । इच्छियपिययममेलओ ।

पडिवालणअसमत्थओ । तम्मइ जुवईसत्थओ ॥

इय पढमं महुमासो जणस्स हिययाइ कुणइ मडयाइ ॥ ६५ ॥

पच्छा विंधइ मयणो लद्धप्पसरेहिं कुसुमबाणेहिं ॥

स्पष्टम् । दुवईखंडं सिरिहरिसएवस्स ।

[कुसुमायुधप्रियदूतकं । मुकुलयश्चूतकम् ।

शिथिलितमानग्रहणो । वाति दक्षिणपवनः ॥

विगलितबकुलामेलकः । इच्छितप्रियतममेलनः ।

प्रतिपालनासमर्थः । ताम्यति युवतिसार्थः ॥

इति प्रथमं मधुमासो जनस्य हृदयानि करोति मृदूनि ।

पश्चाद्विध्याति मदनो लब्धप्रसरेः कुसुमबाणैः ॥ ६५ ॥

द्विपदीखण्डं श्रीहर्षदेवस्य ॥

घत्तादुगं दुहंगी; तिहंगिया दुवइखंडगीईओ ।

पज्झडियाइचउक्कं कडवं; ताणं गणो संधी ॥ ३७ ॥

[घत्ताद्वयं द्विभङ्गी; त्रिभङ्गिका द्विपदीखण्डगीती ।

पञ्चतिकादिचतुष्कं कडवं; तेषां गणः संधिः ॥ ३७ ॥]

घत्ताजात्यन्ते घत्ताजातिरेषापि द्विभङ्गी ॥ ३७ ॥

उदा०—किणि अवरिहि वुज्झिउ । मुग्गडु उज्झिउ । वारिउ जूउवि
वेयरिउ ॥

कथधम्मभंसह । महरामंसह । नाउवि मूलह निट्ठविउ ॥

मरणभयभीयहं । सव्वहं जीयहं । वज्झाविउ अभयप्पडहु ।

रे रायहु रहसिहिं । सहं कुमरसिहिं । तुडिवडंत किन सडिपडहु ॥ ६६ ॥

[कैरपैरर्बुध्यते । मृतस्वमुज्झितं । वारितं यूतमपि वैरीभूतम् ॥

कृतधर्मभ्रंशयोः । मदिरामांसयो । नामापि मूलतो निर्नाशितः ॥

मरणभयभीतानां । सर्वेषां जीवानां । वादितोऽभयपटहः ? ॥

रे राजानो रभसेन । स्वयं कुमारसिंहेन । तोयमानाः किं न पति-

ष्यथ ॥ ६६ ॥

रे शष्टः(ब्दः) (हे ८-२-२०१) संभाषणे । तुडित्ति संरभे । प्राग् द्विपदी ततः
खण्डासि शूचना(?) बलम्बकस्तदन्ते गीतिरियमपि त्रिभङ्गी ।

उदा०—विरहिणिहिययधोरवज्जासणिनिवडणघोसभेरवा

पसरहि मयणरज्जपयासणपणवा कोइलारवा ।

बाह्रिं मलयपवण घणमाणिणिमाणधणिकृतकरा
 निहयसुरयसमरसम्मदकिलामियमिहुणमुहयरा ॥
 दोला लोला चालिया । ससिरिया वणमालिया ।
 असिसिरडण्हा वासरा । रयणी जुण्हामणहरा ॥
 इय एरिसे वसंते महुयरसंकारमुहालियवणंते ।
 मुत्तूण ममं वच्चंत कंत अच्चंतकठिणचित्तोसि ॥ ६७ ॥

[विरिणी दयधोरवज्जाशानिनिपतनघोषभरवाः
 प्रसरन्ति मदनराज्यप्रकाशनपणवाः कोकिलारवाः ।
 वान्ति मलयवाता घनमानिनीमानधनैकतस्कराः
 निर्दयसुरतसमरसंमर्दक्लान्तभिथुनसुखकराः ॥
 दोला लोला चालिता । सश्रीका वनमाणिना ॥
 अशिशिरोष्णा वासराः । रजनी ज्योत्स्नामनोहरा ॥

इतीदृशे वसन्ते मधुकरसंकारमुखरितवनान्ते ।
 मुक्त्वा मां ब्रजन् कान्त अत्यन्तकठिनचित्तोऽसि ॥ ६७ ॥

स्पष्टा । अन्यैरपि छन्दोभिः श्रुतिसुखैस्त्रिभिस्त्रिभिस्त्रिभङ्गी । तत्र पूर्वं मञ्जरी
 पञ्चात्खाण्डिता ततो भद्रिका यथा—

उच्छलंतछप्पयकलगीहभंगधरे
 विष्फुरंतकलयंठिकंठपंचमसरे ।
 सज्जमाणहिंदोलालवणपसाहिप
 चच्चरिपडहुदामसदसंखोहिप ॥

वियसियरत्तासोयलप । केसरकुसुमामोयमप ।
 प्रफुल्लियमायंदवणे । घणघोलिरदक्खिणपवणे ॥
 इय एरिसंमि चित्तप जस्स ण पासंमि अरिथ पियमाणुसं ।
 सो कह जियइ वयंसिप विद्धो मयरद्धयस्स भल्लियाहिं ॥ ५७ ॥

[उच्छलत्पट्टपदकलगीतभाङ्गिधरे
 विस्फुरत्कलकण्ठीकण्ठपञ्चमस्वरे ।
 सज्जमानहिन्दोलालवनप्रसाधिते
 चर्चरीपटहोदामशब्दसंक्षोभिते ॥

विकसितरक्ताशोकलते । केसरकुसुमामोयमप ॥

प्रफुल्लितमाकन्दवने । घनघूर्णमानदक्षिणपवने ॥

इतीदृशे चैत्रे यस्य न पार्श्वेऽस्ति प्रियमनुष्यम् ।

स कथं जीवाति साखि विद्धो मकरध्वजस्य बाणैः ॥ ५७ ॥]

एते च द्विभङ्गीत्रिभङ्गयौ शीर्षकाख्ये । द्वादशपदीप्रकरणम् ।

अय षोडशपदी । पद्धटिकादिछन्दांसि चत्वारि कडवकम् । आदिशब्दाद्वद-
नादिपरिग्रहः । तेषां च कडवकानां गणः संधिसङ्गः ।

उदा०—पुरुगुज्जरमंडलि अइसमिद्धु । अणहिल्लनयरु नामाहि पसिद्धु ।
तहि सिरिचाउक्कडवंसजाय । वणरायपमुह हुय बहुयराय ॥
अह कालकमिण रणरंगमल्लु । रिउरायचक्कहियइक्कसल्लु ।
चालुक्कवंसपंकयमरालु । तत्थासि नराहिबु कुमरवालु ॥
बहुदिहिण बहुपरिकरिसमग्गु । तिणि सम्मु परिकित्ठउ धम्ममग्गु]
जिणसासणु बहुगुणु भाणि पवत्तु । न विवेयलक्खिं तुल्लइ सयत्तुं ॥
नहलग्गसिहरजिणहरणिवेस । मणहर असेस तिणि विहिय देस ।
तसु सरिसु नरेसरु मणुयलोइ । न हु हुयड न होसइ नत्थि
कोइ ॥ ६८ ॥

[पुरुगुर्जरमण्डले अतिसमृद्धं । नगरमणहिल्लनाम्ना प्रसिद्धम् ।
तत्र श्रीचापोत्कटवंशजाताः । वनराजप्रमुखा जाता बहुनृपाः ॥
अथ कालक्रमेण रणङ्गमल्लः । रिपुराजचक्रहृदयैकशल्यम् ॥
चालुक्यवंशपङ्कजमरालः । तत्रासीन्नराधिपः कुमारपालः ॥
बहुदिवसैर्बहुपरिकरसमग्रः । तेन सम्यक्परीक्षितो धर्ममार्गः ॥ ।
जिनशासनं बहुगुणं भणित्वा प्रवृत्तः । न विवेकलक्ष्ये तोलयते मुदितः ॥
न भोल ग्रशिखरजिनगृहनिवेशः । मनोहगोशेषस्तेन विहितो देशः ॥
तस्य सदृशो नरेश्वरो मनुजलोके । न खलु भूतो न भविष्यति नास्ति-
कोपि ॥ ६८ ॥

स्पष्टम् । सन्ध्युदाहरणं प्रतीतम् । षोडशपदीप्रकरणम् ।

इति कविदर्पणवृत्तौ द्वितीयोद्देशः ॥ गाथा ३७ मूलोदाहरणानि ६८
टीकोदाहरणानि ५७ ॥

। श्रीः । तुल्योद्देशः ।

अथ वर्णच्छन्दः ।

इतो वृच्छं सवंपि लाहवन्थं सलक्ष्यलक्षणयम् ।
वक्ष्यच्छंदे वित्तं अहिकिज्जइ; तं पुणो तिबिहम् ॥ १ ॥
[इतो वक्ष्ये सर्वमपि लाघवार्थं सलक्ष्यलक्षणकम् ।
वर्णच्छन्दे वृत्तमपिक्रियते तत्पुनस्त्रिविधम् ॥ १ ॥

इतो मात्राच्छन्दसोनन्तरं सर्वमपि वर्णच्छन्द उभयच्छन्दश्च सलक्ष्यलक्षणकं
वक्ष्ये । तदेवोदाहरणं तदेव सूत्रमित्यर्थः । लक्षणकमिति स्वार्थं कः । किमर्थं रीतिभङ्ग
इत्याह—लाघवार्थम् । भिन्नलक्षणत्वे हि ग्रन्थगौरवं स्यात् । मात्राच्छन्दस्तु लक्ष्यैः

सुक्षेयमिति तथोक्तम् । इदं चादौ प्रपञ्चितमेव । तथा वर्णच्छन्दासि वृत्तमधिक्रियते । इतो यद्वक्ष्यते तद्वृत्ताख्यमित्यर्थः । तच्च स्थिरगुरुलघ्वक्षरविन्यासमिष्यते । पाठं न(१) संयोगयोरभावात् । मात्राच्छन्दस्तु जात्याख्यम् । यदाह—पयं चतुष्पदी तच्च वृत्तं जातिरिति । एतत्पुनर्बृत्तं त्रिविधं तथाहि—

सममन्द्रसमं विसमं तत्थ समं ताव तुल्यचउपायम् ।

तुल्यं अन्द्रसमं; अतुल्यसव्वप्ययं विसमम् ॥ २ ॥

[सममर्धसमं विषमं तत्र समं तावत्तुल्यचतुष्पादम् ।

तुल्यार्धमर्धसमं; अतुल्यसर्वपादं विषमम् ॥ २ ॥

समवृत्तमर्धसमवृत्तं विषमवृत्तम् । तत्र त्रिके तावत्तुल्यलक्षणैश्चतुर्भिः पादैः समवृत्तम् । तुल्यलक्षणाभ्यामर्धाभ्यामर्धसमवृत्तम् । विसदृशैः सर्वैः पादैर्विषमवृत्तम् ।

तेषु समे एकस्वरमुहच्छ्वीसकस्वरंतचउपाई ।

छ्वीस हुंति जाई; तो सेसं दंडया तत्तो ॥ ३ ॥

[तेषु समे एकाक्षरमुखषड्विंशत्यक्षरान्तचतुष्पायः ।

षड्विंशतिर्भवन्ति जातयस्ततः शेषं दण्डकास्तस्मात् ॥ ३ ॥]

तेषु त्रिषु समवृत्ते चतुर्णां पादानां समाहारश्चतुष्पादी । एकाक्षरादिः षड्विंशत्यक्षरान्ता चतुष्पादी यासु ताः षड्विंशतिर्जातयः स्युस्ततः सेसंति शेष-जातिस्ततो दण्डकजातिः ।

उत्त अइउत्त मज्झा पइट्ट सुपइट्ट तहय गाइत्ती ।

उण्ही अणुहुभ विहई पंती तिहुउ जगइअइजगई ॥ ४ ॥

सक्करिअइसक्कारिया अट्ठी अइअट्ठि धिइअअहिइउ ।

किइ पाविसमभिडप्परकिई य जाईण नामाई ॥ ५ ॥

[उक्तात्युक्ता मध्या प्रतिष्ठासुप्रतिष्ठे तथा च गायत्री ।

उष्णिगनुष्टुबृहती पङ्क्तिच्छिष्टुप् जगत्यतिजगती ॥ ४ ॥

शक्वर्यतिशक्वर्यौ अष्टिरत्यष्टिर्धृतिरतिधृतिः ।

कृतिः प्राविसमभ्युत्परतः कृतयश्च जातीनां नामानि ॥ ५ ॥

उक्ता १ अत्युक्ता २ मध्या ३ प्रतिष्ठा ४ सुप्रतिष्ठा ५ तथा च गायत्री ६ उष्णिक् ७ अनुष्टुप् ८ बृहती ९ पङ्क्तिः १० त्रिष्टुप् ११ जगती १२ अतिजगती १३ शक्वरी १४ अतिशक्वरी १५ अष्टिः १६ अत्यष्टिः १७ धृतिः १८ अतिधृतिः १९ कृतिः २० प्र । आ । वि । सम् । अभि । उत् । एभ्यः परा कृतिश्च । प्रकृतिः २१ आकृतिः २२ विकृतिः २३ संस्कृतिः २४ अभिकृतिः २५ उत्कृतिः २६ जातीनां नामानि । उक्ता नाम एकैकाक्षराङ्गभिभेदसंग्रहात्मिका जातिस्ततः एकैकाक्षरवृद्धा-ङ्गयोऽत्युक्तादयस्तत्र द्व्यक्षराङ्गमिरत्युक्ता । षड्विंशत्यक्षराङ्गमिरकृतिः ।

इति ऋग्वेदोक्तौ नृतीयोद्देशः ।

अथ चतुर्थोद्देशः ।

[In this chapter, Sanskrit rendering of the text is not given as it is quite unnecessary. It has been dropped even where it is given in the commentary.]

अथ जातीनामुपयोगिभेदानाह—

गो गी ॥ १ ॥

सर्वाङ्गिष्वेको गुरुर्गीच्छन्द ॥ १ ॥ उक्ता ॥ १ ॥

दो गा इत्थी ॥ २ ॥

द्वौ गुरु ब्रीच्छन्दः । अत्युक्ता ॥ २ ॥ एकेनाङ्गिणा प्राकृते लक्ष्म वक्तुमशक्यमिति द्वाभ्यामुक्तमतः परं त्वेकेकेन समानि, द्वाभ्यामर्धसमानि विषमाणि वैयालीयानि च वक्ष्यन्ते ॥ २ ॥

मो नारी ॥ ३ ॥ रो मिगी ॥ ४ ॥

स्पष्टम् ॥ मध्या ॥ ३ ॥

मोगो कक्षा ॥ ५ ॥ यगा वीला ॥ ६ ॥ प्रतिष्ठा ॥ ४ ॥

नन्दा तलगा ॥ ७ ॥ जया योलगा ॥ ८ ॥ सुप्रतिष्ठा ॥ ५ ॥

ताया तणुमज्झा ॥ ९ ॥ यया सोमराई ॥ १० ॥ गायत्री ॥ ६ ॥

मोसोगो मयलेहा ॥ ११ ॥ हंसमाला ररगो ॥ १२ ॥ उष्णिक् ॥ ७ ॥

दोमा दोगा विज्जूमाला ॥ १३ ॥ भोतलगा माणवकं ॥ १४ ॥ चित्तवया भगुरुदो ॥ १५ ॥ नारायओ तरालगा ॥ १६ ॥ वसू लगा पमाणिया ॥ १७ ॥ उक्कमे समाणिया उ ॥ १८ ॥ इओय अन्नं वियाणं ॥ १९ ॥

टीकाः—क्षुर्भिर्यतिरनुक्तापि ज्ञेया ॥ १३ ॥ अत्रापि चतुर्भिर्यतिः ॥ १४॥१५॥ १६॥ अष्टनिरन्तरा लगाः प्रमाणिका ॥ १७ ॥ प्रमाणिकाया विपर्यये समानिका अष्टौ निरन्तरा गला इत्यर्थः ॥ १८ ॥ एभ्यः प्रागुक्तेभ्यो ग्रन्थान्तरोक्तेभ्यश्चकारावक्ष्यमाणेभ्योऽन्यसमवृत्तं वितानम् ॥ १९ ॥ अनुष्टम्भ ॥ ८ ॥

रोनसा किर हलमुही ॥ २० ॥ मोनोयो मगरलयाप ॥ २१ ॥ नसयघडिया विसाला ॥ २२ ॥

टीकाः—किलेत्याप्रोक्तौ ॥ २० ॥ बृहती ॥ ९ ॥

मोरसारणी रजारगता ॥ २३ ॥ मोसो सुद्धविराडिया जगा ॥ २४ ॥ नरजगा इमा मणोरमा ॥ २५ ॥ चंपयमालेयं भमसागो ॥ २६ ॥ पाङ्क्तिः ॥ १० ॥

रोनरा लहुगुरू रहुद्धया ॥ २७ ॥ सागया उ रनभा दुगुरंता ॥ २८ ॥ भस्ति-मदोगुरु दोषयछंदं ॥ २९ ॥ ननरलहुगुरूहिं भदिया ॥ ३० ॥ रोजरा लहु गुरू य सेणिया ॥ ३१ ॥ न जजलहु सगुरू सुमुही ॥ ३२ ॥ नजुगसगणहुगुरू चित्ता ॥ ३३ ॥ तो

जो जगमात्ति उवाट्टिया सा ॥ ३४ ॥ उवाट्टियमिमं जो सो तगागो ॥ ३३ ॥ मो दो
तागा सालिणी सायरेहिं ॥ ३६ ॥ वाउम्मी मो तह भो तो गुरू दो ॥ ३७ ॥ तो तो
जगागो पुण इंदवज्जा ॥ २८ ॥ उर्विंदवज्जा जतजा गुरू दो ॥ ३९ ॥

परुप्परं दुण्हमिमाण पायाविमिस्सणं चुद्धसहोवजाई ॥

जाईण इत्तोवरपच्छिमाण सव्वाण बुद्धेहिं पुणो वइट्ठा ॥ ४० ॥

टीका:—॥ २७॥२८॥२९॥३०॥३१॥३२॥३३॥३४॥३५ ॥ सागरैरिति चतुर्भि-
र्यतिः ॥ ३६ ॥ सागरैरिति (अनु)वर्तते ॥ ३७॥३८॥३९ ॥ अनयोरग्रतः पृष्ठतश्च
प्रत्यक्षयोरिन्द्रवज्रोपेन्द्रवज्रयोरिन्द्रवंशावंशस्थयोश्चान्योन्यं पादविमिश्रणं अङ्गमि-
संकर उपजातिः । सा च प्रस्तारभेदाच्चतुर्दशधा । स्थापना चेयम् । आद्यन्तौ मुक्त्वा
चतुर्दश ज्ञेयाः । समवृत्तप्रस्तावोपि उपजातीनामुपन्यासो लाघवार्थः । बहुश्रुतेस्तु
इतः परासां जगत्यादीनां पश्चिमानामुक्तादीनां प्रायो गायत्र्यादीनां कृतनामाकृत-
नामाविसदृशप्रस्ताररूपस्वस्वपादानां स्वरूपभेदानां सर्वासां जातीनां संकर
उपजातिरुपदिष्टा यथा:—

युधिष्ठिरो धर्ममयो महाद्रुमः स्कन्धोर्जुनो भीमसेनोस्य शाखा ॥

माद्रीसुतो पुष्पफले समृद्धे मूलं कृष्णो ब्रह्म च ब्राह्मणाश्च ॥ ४० ॥

त्रिष्टुप् ॥ ११ ॥

सा इंदवंसा उ तता जरा जहिं ॥ ४१ ॥ मुणेह वंसत्थमिणं जताजरा ॥ ४२ ॥
जत्थ रा हुंति चत्तारि सा सग्गिणी ॥ ४२ ॥ जहिं वेयया तं भुयंगप्पयायं ॥ ४४ ॥
चउसं मुण तोडयमित्थ पुणो ॥ ४५ ॥ दुयविलंबिय नाम नभा भरा ॥ ४६ ॥ पमि-
यक्खरा सजजसेहिं कया ॥ ४७ ॥ जभा जरा जहिमिमा पियंवया ॥ ४८ ॥
नयनयबद्धा कुसुमविचित्ता ॥ ४९ ॥ पमुह्यवयणा नना रहुं ॥ ५० ॥ इहहि
नजेहि जरेहि मालई ॥ ५१ ॥ निसुणह तामरसं नजजायो ॥ ५२ ॥ रवी लगा
कमा वसंतचत्तरं ॥ ५३ ॥ दोमा या नेया पंचहिं वेसएवी ॥ ५४ ॥ जलुद्धयगई छहिं
जसजसा ॥ ५५ ॥ इत्थं पुण तोयो तोयो मणिमाला ॥ ५६ ॥ नदुगमिह पुडो मो
यो वसूहिं ॥ ५७ ॥

टीका:—॥ ४१॥४२॥४३ ॥ यत्र याश्चत्वारस्तद्भुजङ्गप्रयातम् ॥ ४४॥४५॥४६॥
४७॥४८॥४९॥५०॥५१॥५२ ॥ द्वादश लगाः क्रमाद्वसन्तचत्वरम् ॥ ५३ ॥ पञ्चभि-
र्यतिः ॥ ५४ ॥ षड्भिर्यतिः ॥ ५५ ॥ षड्भिरिति वर्तते ॥ ५६ ॥ वसुभिरष्टाभिर्यतिः ॥ ५७ ॥
जगती ॥ १२ ॥

मो नो जो पहरिसिणी रगा सिहीहिं ॥ ५८ ॥ मो तो यो सो गो चउहिं
मत्तमयूरं ॥ ५९ ॥ जभासजा गुरु रुहरा भाणिजए ॥ ६० ॥ नदुगतरगणा गोय चंदि-
याए ॥ ६१ ॥

टीका:—त्रिभिर्यतिः ॥ ५८ ॥ चतुर्भिर्यतिः ॥ ५९ ॥ चतुर्भिर्यतिरिति वर्तते ॥ ६० ॥
अतिजगती ॥ १३ ॥

तोमो वसंततिलया जदुगं गुरू दो ॥६२॥ जलहिनपरगुरुदुगमुवचित्तम् ॥६३॥
बाणेहिं मो तो नसदुगुरु असंबाहा ॥६४॥ इसिहि ननरसा लगा अवराइया ॥६५॥
परणकलिया ननभनलगुरू ॥६६॥

टीकाः—चतुर्नगणपरं गुरुद्विकमुपचित्रम् ॥६३॥ पञ्चाभिर्यतिः ॥६४॥ सप्त-
भिर्यतिः ॥६५॥ ऋषिभिरिति वर्तते ॥६६॥ शक्वरी ॥१४॥

बाणा मा जस्सि तं कामक्रीला नामं नायब्बं ॥६७॥ चउदसलहुयपरगुरु ससि-
कला ॥६८॥ रोजराजरा गणा जहिं तमित्थ तोणयं ॥६९॥ हवइ पभदकं नजभजा
तहेव रो ॥७०॥ आसेहिं चंदलेहाछंदं मरा मो ययौ यो ॥७१॥ ननमययगणा
मालिणी पन्नगेहिं ॥७२॥ पसा चित्ता बुत्ता जीए तिल्लि मा किंच दोया ॥७३॥

टीकाः—यस्मिन्पञ्च मास्तत्कामक्रीडा नाम ज्ञातव्यम् ॥ ६७॥६८॥६९॥७० ॥
सप्तभिर्यतिः ॥७१॥ अष्टभिर्यतिः ॥७२॥ पन्नगैरिति वर्तते ॥७३॥ अतिशक्वरी ॥१५॥

स पंचचामरो जहिं लहुगुरू निवा कमा ॥७४॥ तोणयस्स अंतए कएण गेण
चित्तमुत्तं ॥७५॥ आसगई उण पंचहिं भेहिं तहा गुरुणा ॥७६॥ परिकहिया न जा
भजरगा य वाणिणीए ॥७७॥ नजरभभा गुरू जहिं सा मणिकप्पलया ॥७८॥ भण
दुगुणवसुलहुमचलदिहिमिह ॥७९॥

टीकाः—यत्र लघुगुरवः क्रमात् षोडश ॥७४॥ पूर्वोक्तस्य तोणकस्य । पञ्च-
चामरव्यत्ययः सगुरुरित्यर्थः ॥ ७५॥७६॥७७॥७८ ॥ द्विगुणवसवः षोडशलघवो
यस्यां ॥७९॥ अष्टिः ॥१६॥

मंदकंता चउहिं रिउहिं मोभनातोतगागो ॥८०॥ रिउहिं चउहिं नोसोमोरो-
सला हरिणी गुरू ॥८१॥ रसेहिं निहिइठा यमनसभलागो सिहरिणी ॥८२॥ वसूहिं
पुहवी जसाजसयला तहंते गुरू ॥८३॥ पंतिहि वंसपत्तपडियं भरतभनलगा ॥८३॥

टीकाः—चतुर्भिः षड्भिश्च यतिः ॥८०॥ षड्भिश्चतुर्भिश्च यतिः ॥८१॥ षड्-
भिर्यतिः ॥८२॥ अष्टभिर्यतिः ॥८३॥ दशभिर्यतिः ॥८४॥ अत्यष्टिः ॥१७॥

नगुलरचउकानिप्फजिया वजिया तारया ॥८५॥ भोरननानसा नवहिं निसु-
णह भमरवयं ॥८६॥

टीकाः—॥८५॥ नवभिर्यतिः ॥८६॥ धृतिः ॥१८॥

तरुणीवयणिंदुमिमं कहियं सगणा छ तहा गो ॥८७॥ मोसोजो सतता गुरू य
रविहिं स लुविकीडियं ॥८८॥

टीकाः—॥८७॥ द्वादशभिर्यतिः ॥८८॥ अतिधृतिः ॥१९॥

गालहू निरंतरा जहिं तु वीस तं खु जाण चित्त नाम ॥८९॥ बुत्ता सत्तहुगेणं
मरभनयभला गंता सुवयणा ॥९०॥

टीकाः—खलु निश्चयात् ॥ ८९॥ सप्तभिः सप्तभिर्यतिः ॥ ९० ॥ कृतिः ॥२०॥

बुधयजसम्भया नजभजा जदुगं रगणो य सिद्धिया ॥९१॥ आसेहिं भूधरेहिं
मरभनययया सद्धरा नाम नेया ॥९२॥

टीकाः—॥९१॥ अश्वैर्भूधरैर्यतिः सप्तभिः सप्तभिरित्यर्थः ॥ ९२ ॥ प्रकृतिः
॥ २१ ॥

सप्तभनिन्मियमंतपह्रियपगगुरू य लयाकुसुमं ॥९३॥ भद्रयसुल्लवंति विउसा
भरानरनरानगा य दसहिं ॥९४॥

टीकाः— ॥९३॥ दशभिर्यतिः ॥९४॥ आकृतिः ॥२२॥

रो नराजरनरालहृगुरू तथा जहिं तमिह बिंति चित्तयं ॥ ९५ ॥ मत्तकलीला
मोमोतोनो सिहिनपरलहृगुरू भुयगइसुहिं ॥९६॥

टीकाः—॥९५॥ विविधैः त्रिनपरो भुजगैरष्टभिरिषुभिः पञ्चभिर्यतिः ॥९६॥
विकृतिः ॥२३॥

नगणदुगरछक्कयं मेहमालत्ति छंदं पर्यंपति छंदन्नुया ॥९७॥ बिंति सुभद्रयना-
मयछंदमिहं भगणेहिं बुहा किर अट्टहिं ॥९८॥ संकृतिः ॥२४॥

कुंचपया भोमोसभनानो नगणजुगल गुरुइसु इसु वसुहिं ॥९९॥ सा हंसवया
जीप दसहिं तयभभजलहिनगणपरगुरुगं ॥१००॥

टीकाः—पञ्चभिरष्टभिर्यतिः ॥९९॥ दशभिर्यतिः ॥१००॥ अभिकृतिः ॥ २५ ॥

मो मो तो नो नो नो रो सो लहुगुरुवसुपसुवइहिं भुयंगवियंभियं ॥१०१॥
मो ना छच्चिय जहिं नवछछहिं सगणदुगुरुणिहणमववाहं तं ॥ १०२ ॥

टीकाः—अष्टभिरैकादशभिर्यतिः ॥ १०१ ॥ नवभिः षड्भिर्यतिः ॥ १०२ ॥
उत्कृतिः ॥ २३ ॥ उक्तादिकप्रकरणम् ॥ शेषजातिः ॥

मालावित्तं सेसजाईइ मोतोतगणनगणजुगलं यत्तिगं संकरेहिं ॥ १०३ ॥

टीकाः—मस्तस्तयुगनंयुगं यत्रिकं मालावृत्तं शेषजातौ एकादशभिर्यतिः ।
एवं प्रमोदमहोदयवृत्तललितललितलतापिपीलिकाया अप्यूह्याः । शेषजाति-
प्रकरणम् ॥१०३॥ अथ दण्डकाः ॥

छव्वीसक्खरअहियं दीसइ जं किचि रूवयं छंदे ।

तं दंदयंति पभणंति सेसजाईं विमुत्तुण ॥ १०४ ॥

नदुगरगणसत्तयं जत्थ सो दंडओ चंदबुद्धिप्पयायो मए वज्जिओ ॥१०५॥

जहकम ससिरेहवुद्धीइ अन्नन्नवव्वालजीभूयलीलायरुद्धामसरंवाइआं ॥१०६॥

पच्चिययमिह नजुम्माउ यईहिं सव्वेहिं निव्वत्तियं सत्तखुत्तो कएहिं ॥१०७॥

जहिच्छया लहृगुरू निरंतरा हवंति जत्थ दंडओ इमो अणंगसेहरो ॥१०८॥

वच्चयम्मि एयमेव छेयलोयकन्नदिन्नमुक्खया असोयपुप्फमंजरिति ॥१०९॥

टीकाः—षड्विंशत्यक्षराधिकं शेषजातेरन्यथात्मिकमपि छन्दसि रूपकं दृश्यते
तदण्डकमित्याहुर्वृद्धाः । यथोक्तम् ।

यत्किंचिद्दृश्यते छन्दः षड्विंशत्यक्षराधिकम् ॥

शेषजात्यादिकं मुक्त्वा तत्सर्वं दण्डकं विदुः ॥१०४॥१०५॥

चण्डवृष्टिप्रयातस्योर्ध्वम् । ससिरेहति एकैकरमणवृष्ट्या यथाक्रममर्णाया दण्ड-
काः स्युः । एवं नगणान्यां परैरष्टभीरगणैर्णः । नवभिरणवो दशभिर्याल एकादश-
भिर्जीमूतो द्वादशभिर्लीलाकरस्त्रयोदशभिरुद्दामश्चतुर्दशभिः शङ्खः । आदिशब्दात्प-
ञ्चदशभिः समुद्रः । षोडशभिर्भुजङ्ग इत्येवमादयो यथेष्टकृतनामानो यावदेकोनसह
स्राक्षराः पादास्तावद्भवन्ति ॥१०६॥ इहानुक्रमेण नयुग्माक्षगणवर्जं यगणादिसर्व-
वर्णगणैः सप्तकृत्वः कृतैर्निर्वर्तितं प्रचलितकं नाम दण्डकः ॥ अत्रापि सप्तानां
यगणादीनामुपर्येकैकयगणादिवृद्ध्या अर्णायाः स्युः पूर्ववत् ॥१०७॥१०८॥ पतदे-
वानङ्गशेखररूपकं व्यत्यये निरन्तरगुरुलघुत्वे छेकलोऽर्णः ॥१०९॥ अशोकपुष्प-
मञ्जरीति दण्डकजातिः ॥१०९॥ समवृत्तप्रकरणम् ॥ अथार्धसमवृत्तान्याह ।

सतिगं लगुरू विसमे समे । भत्तिगदोगुरुआवुवचितं ॥११०॥ विसमंमि
उवंतलमुक्कं । तंचिय वेगवइं मुण छंदं ॥१११॥ विसमे सजासगणगंता । केउमई
समे भरनगागो ॥११२॥ रोजरा य जो य ओयपाययंमि । समे जराजरा गुरू मई
जवाइ ॥११३॥ सतिगं विसमे लहुओं गुरू । नभभरा य समे हरिणुद्धया ॥११४॥
ओयसमेसु कमा वुयमज्झा । तिभदुगुरू अह नो जदुगं यो ॥११५॥ इह किर विस-
मंमि नो नरायो । नजजरगा समयंमि पुप्फियग्गा ॥११६॥ निहणसासिगुरूमि
उज्झिये । दुसुवि इमावरवत्तसंजिया ॥११७॥

टीकाः-- विषमे प्रथमे तृतीयेद्व्यौ ॥११०॥ आपातलिकेयम् ॥१११॥११२॥
यववतीत्यर्थः ॥ ११३॥११४॥ उपचित्रा आपातलिका अपरान्तिकेयम् ॥११५॥
औपच्छन्दसिकमेतत् ॥११६॥ बैतालीयमेतत् ॥ आख्यानकीविपरीताख्यान-
क्यानुपजात्यन्तर्गतत्वाच्चोक्ते ॥ विषमे नव नगणा लघुगुरू; समे दशनगणा
गुरूः शिखा । विषमे नगणदशकं गुरूः समे नगणनवकं लघुगुरू खञ्जा ।
द्वयोरप्यर्धयोर्नवनवनगणा गुरुरतिरुचिरेत्यादि ग्रन्थान्तराज्ज्ञेयम् । ११७ ॥ अर्ध-
समवृत्तप्रकरणम् ॥

अणुहुभे गणा सव्वे अनसा आइवज्जाओ ॥

यो चउत्थाउ ओयंतटाउ गोली व वत्तंति ॥११८॥

पत्थावत्तं समप्पाए यगणे जगणो जई ॥

तदेव विसमंमि जो समे यो विवरीयाई ॥११९॥

नं चं व होइ चवला नगणेण जगणंमि ॥

विडला सा समे जीए किज्जए सत्तमो लहु ॥१२०॥

चउसुं सेयवस्स सा ॥१२१॥ मो मव्वीडला ओयांमि ॥१२२॥ तहेव नो नवि-
उला ॥१२३॥ भो जइ ता भव्विउला ॥१२४॥ रो रव्वीडला उ नेया ॥१२५॥ सो
जत्थ सविउला सा ॥१२६॥ तो तव्विउला अक्खिया ॥१२७॥

टीकाः—अथ विषमवृत्तान्याह । अनुष्टुभि अष्टाक्षरायां जातौ पादस्याद्या-
दक्षरात्परे नगणसगणवर्जं सर्वे षडपि गणाः स्युश्चतुर्थादक्षरात्परो यगणः पादस्या-
दावन्ते गुरुलघुर्वा स्यात्तद्वक्त्रमिति ज्ञेयम् । आद्याङ्ग्वरायस्थाने ग्लाविति द्वौ भेदौ;
द्वितीये नसवर्जना षोडशगणैः षट् । तृतीये च एकः । तुर्ये ग्लाविति द्वौ । अन्योन्या-
भ्यासे चतुर्विंशतिः । प्रत्यङ्गभि चतुर्विंशतेर्भावादन्योन्यास्ते तिल्लो लक्षा एकत्रिंश-
त्सहस्राः सप्त शतानि षट्सप्ततिः । एवमेषैव संख्या विपुलाभेदेष्वापि ॥ ११८ ॥
समपादयोस्तुर्याक्षरायगणस्थाने. जगणश्चेत्तदा वक्त्रमेव पथ्यावक्त्राख्यम् । विष-
मयोस्तुर्याक्षराज्जगणः समयोर्यगणः शेषं तथैव वक्त्रवयत्र तद्विपरीतादि विपरीत-
पथ्यावक्त्रम् ॥ ११९ ॥ तदेव विपरीतपथ्यावक्त्रं जगणस्थाने नगणेन चपलावक्त्रा-
ख्यम् । विषमयोस्तुर्याक्षरात् नगणः समयोस्तु यगण इत्यर्थः । समयोः सप्तमो
लघुर्यस्यां क्रियते सा विपुलावक्त्राख्या । न चेयं पथ्यया गतार्था । विपुलावक्त्रस्ये-
दानीमारभ्यमाणत्वात्तां विना तस्यानुपपत्तेः समपादयोः सप्तमलघुनावश्यं भाव्यम् ।
विषमयोस्तु मादिभिर्यगणस्यापवादं वक्ष्यति । पथ्यायां तु यगण एवावतिष्ठते ॥ १२० ॥
सैतवाचार्यमते चतुर्षु पादेषु सप्तमो लघुश्चेद्विपुलावक्त्रम् ॥ १२१ ॥ ओजयोस्तुर्या-
क्षरायगणं बाधित्वा मगणः ; समयोस्तु सप्तमो लघुः स्थित एव चेन्मविपुला ।
ओज इति जातिपक्षे द्वयोरपि पादयोर्ग्रहणम् । व्यक्तिपक्षे पुनरेकस्य प्रथमस्य
तृतीयस्य वा । एवं वक्ष्यमाणविपुलास्वपि । तथा च महाकवीनां प्रयोगः ।

सर्वातिरिक्तं लावण्यं बिभ्रती चारुविभ्रमा ॥

स्त्रीलोकसृष्टिः सा नूनं न सामान्यस्य वेधसः ॥ १ ॥

व्यक्तिपक्षे यथाः—

गतः स कालो यत्रासीन्मुक्तानां जन्म × × × ॥

वर्तन्ते × × × स्तासां साम्प्रतं शुक्तिसंपुटाः ॥ २ ॥

तथाः—

वज्रादपि कठोराणि मृदूनि कुसुमादपि ॥

लोकोत्तराणां चेतांसि कोहि निज्ञातुमर्हति ॥ ३ ॥ १२२ ॥

तथैव विषमाङ्घ्रितुर्याक्षराज्जगणश्चेन्नविपुला । जातिपक्षे यथाः—

दृशा दग्धं मनसिजं जीवयन्ति दृशैव याः ॥

विरूपाक्षस्य जयिनीस्ताः स्तुवे वामलोचनाः ॥ १ ॥

व्यक्तिपक्षे यथाः—

दीनायां दीनवदनो रुदत्यां साश्रुलोचनः ॥

पुरः सखीजनस्तस्याः प्रतिबिम्बमिवाभवत् ॥ २ ॥

तथाः—

अन्यदा सूर्यं पुंसां शमो लज्जेव योषितः ॥

पराक्रमः परिभवे वैयास्यं सुरतेष्विव ॥ ३ ॥ १२३ ॥

तथैव भक्षेद्भविपुला । जातिपक्षे यथाः--

इयं सखे चन्द्रमुखी स्मितज्योत्स्नावभासिनी ॥

इन्दीवराक्षी हृदयं दन्दहीति तथापि मे ॥ १ ॥

व्यक्तिपक्षे यथाः--

सुवर्णपुरुषां पृथिवीं चिन्दन्ति पुरुषास्त्रयः ॥

शूरश्च कृतवियश्च यश्च जानाति सेवितुम् ॥ २ ॥

तथाः--

सर्वाशुचिनिधानस्य कृतघ्नस्य विनाशिनः ॥

शरीरकस्यापि कृते मूढाः पापानि कुर्वते ॥ ३ ॥ १२४ ॥

तथैव रमणश्चेद्भविपुला तु ज्ञेया । जातिपक्षे यथाः--

वधूभिः पीनस्तनीभिस्तूलीभिः कुङ्कुमेन च ॥

कालागरुधूपधूमैर्हमन्ते जयति स्मरः ॥ १ ॥

व्यक्तिपक्षे यथाः--

महाकविं कालिदासं वन्दे वाग्देवतां गुरुम् ॥

यज्ज्ञाने विश्वमाभाति दर्पणप्रतिबिम्बवत् ॥ २ ॥

तथाः--

काभिनीभिः मुखं संगः क्रियते पण्डितैरपि ॥

यदि न स्याद्धारिवीचिचञ्चलं हतजीवितम् ॥ ३ ॥ १२५ ॥

तथैव यत्र सगणः सा सविपुला । जातिपक्षे यथाः--

क्षणविध्वंसिनि लोके का चिन्ता मरणे रणे ॥

कोहि मन्दः सहसैव स्वल्पेन बहु हारयेत् ॥ १ ॥

व्यक्तिपक्षे यथाः--

श्रोत्रे सति न शृणोति सति नेत्रे न पश्यति ॥

वक्त्रे सत्यापि नो वक्ति पार्थिवस्तेन पार्थिवः ॥ २ ॥

तथाः--

कौटिल्यपटवः पापा मायया बकवत्तया ॥

धूर्त्वेन वञ्चयमानाः वञ्चयन्ते स्वमेवाहि ॥ ३ ॥ १२६ ॥

तथैव तमणश्चेत्तविपुला आख्याता । जातिपक्षे यथाः--

येन हता पादेन सा जातिलुब्धेन मल्लिका ॥

अलेस्तस्य दैवादहो बदर्यपि सुदुर्लभा ॥ १ ॥

व्यक्तिपक्षे यथाः--

वन्दे कविं श्रीभारविं लोकसन्तमसच्छिदम् ॥

दिवा दीपा इवाभान्ति यस्याग्रे कवयः परे ॥ २ ॥

लोकवत्प्रतिपत्तव्यो लौकिकोर्थः परीक्षकैः ॥

लोकव्यवहारं प्रति सदृशौ बालपण्डितौ ॥ ३ ॥

संकीर्णाश्च विपुलाप्रकारा दृश्यन्ते । यथा:--

क्वचित्कालं प्रसरता क्वचिदापत्यनिघ्नता(?) ॥

शुनेव सारङ्गकुलं त्वया भिषं द्विषां बलम् ॥ ४ ॥

तुल्येपराधे स्वर्भानुर्भानुमन्तं चिरेण यत् ॥

हिमांशुमाशु प्रसते तन्मृद्विन्नः स्फुटं फलम् ॥ ५ ॥

इत्यादयस्तेतु स्वधुभ्याभ्युह्याः । सर्वासां च विपुलानां चतुर्थो वर्णः प्रायेण गुरुर्भवतीत्याज्ञायः । १२७ ॥ वक्त्रजातिप्रकरणम् ॥

पठन्ममि अट्टवक्त्रा ।

दुइयंमि दुवालस निबज्जंति ॥

तइए सोलस चउत्थए वीस जत्थ पाए ।

तं पयचउरुद्धनामयं पयंपंति विसमच्छन्दं ॥ १२८ ॥

स्पष्टम् । पदचतुर्ध्वं न्यासभेदाच्चतुर्विंशतिधा । स्थापनाः-- पदचतुर्ध्वेन पदचतुर्ध्वप्रकरणमुपलक्ष्यते यथा । पदचतुर्ध्वमेव प्रतिपादमादी द्विगुरुकं ततः सर्वलघ्वक्षरं यद्वा प्रतिपादमादावन्ते च द्विगुरुकं शेषसर्वलघुकं सा आपीडः । आपीड एवायस्याङ्गमेर्द्धितीयाङ्गघ्रिणा व्यत्यये कलिका । तृतीयेन लबली । तुर्येणामृत-धारा ॥ १२८ ॥ पदचतुर्ध्वप्रकरणम् ॥

सजसा लहु पढमयंमि । नसजगुरुणो दुइज्जए ॥

हुंति भनजलगुरू तइए । तुरिए सजासजगुरू य उग्गया ॥ १२९ ॥

स्पष्टा । उद्धतया उद्धताप्रकरणसंग्रहो ज्ञेयः । यथा । उद्धतेव तृतीयाङ्गघ्रौ रनभगाश्चेत् सौरभकम् । ननससास्तु चेल्ललितम् ॥ १२९ ॥ उद्धताप्रकरणम् ॥

आइल्ले मसजा भगागुरू अहबीए । सनजा रगुरु तह्मिमे ननासो ॥

नतिगजय तुरिअए । इय मुणह पच्चुवियमुवाट्टियपुव्वं ॥ १३० ॥

स्पष्टम् । उपस्थितप्रचुपितेन तत्प्रकरणं सूचितम् । यथा । इदमेव तृतीयेङ्गघ्रौ नन-सननसाश्चेद्धर्मानम् । इदमेव तृतीयेङ्गघ्रौ तजराश्चेत् शुद्धविराट्प्रभम् । उप-स्थितप्रचुपितप्रकरणम् । पूर्वार्धे षोडश गुरवः उत्तरार्धे द्वात्रिंशल्लघवः सौम्या । पूर्वार्धे द्वात्रिंशल्लघवः उत्तरार्धे षोडश गुरवो ज्योतिः । विषमप्रकरणम् ॥ १३० ॥

इति कविदर्पणवृत्तौ चतुर्थोद्देशः ।

(To be continued)

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE FIGURES OF
SPEECH IN THE R̥GVEDA *

BY

ABEL BERGAIGNE

(Translated into English by A. Venkatasubbiah)

[1] This article will have only an indirect relation to the ordinary labours of the Société de Linguistique. I do not however undertake in it, as the title may lead one to imagine, a purely literary study, at finding which in our *Memoirs*, one may justly feel astonished. The facts to which I am going to draw attention concern philology, and particularly Vedic lexicography.

The rhetoric of the Vedas is in reality a bizarre one which seems to shock even to this day the most authoritative interpreters of the R̥gveda. Rather than be consistent in their translations, they have, in order to avoid the strangeness of the figures, and chiefly the cacophony of the discordant metaphors, had recourse to a certain extent to all kinds of means. When the obliteration of the figures, or even the wholesale substitution of plain words for figurative ones, has seemed insufficient in their eyes, they have at no time shrunk from doing the utmost violence to the lexicography.

However, I concede readily that the two scholars who have given us recently complete translations of the R̥gveda have not yielded in the same degree to the repugnance which the rhetoric in question must engender in all persons with our modern taste. In many of the cases where Grassmann has retreated before the boldness or incoherence of Vedic figures, Ludwig¹ has held his

* The original article, entitled " Quelques observations sur les figures de rhétorique dans le R̥gveda " was published in *Memoires de la Société de Linguistique*, Tome IV, fascicule 2, pp. 1-42.

¹ The translation of Ludwig is, on the whole, a very estimable work, very superior in regard to accuracy to that of Grassmann; but it will become perfectly intelligible only with the help of the commentary which is to follow it. As regards Grassmann, he has assuredly, by the publication of his dictionary, rendered signal service to Vedic philologists. But he has aggravated in his translation the defects of interpretation that are already perceptible in his former work.

ground. Still he too has been lacking in courage on more than one occasion.

[2] I have already referred to them at length.¹ My translations have appeared so crabbed to a serious critic² as to force from him this singular opinion: "On the whole I avow that I would rather be in the wrong with Roth and Grassmann than understand the Veda rightly with Bergaigne." I shall be still more bold on this occasion. I shall not be content with holding my ground before the monster on all the occasions when it presents itself before me in connection with a verse; but I am going to give chase to it throughout the collection of hymns. I hope to show that this "extreme harshness of expression"³ on which my interpretations often border is not only tolerated, but is actually recommended, by Vedic rhetoric, that in other words, the authors of the hymns are never more satisfied with themselves than when they have put together words which "scream with fright at seeing themselves joined together."

BOLDNESS OF THE SIMILES

The boldness of Vedic similes is well-known. None of the processes of interpretation that I am going to criticise here has been able to efface totally this characteristic trait of the poetry of the *ṛsis*. Even the most obliterated translation, the interpretation that is the most intentionally colourless, that of Grassmann for instance, teems still in strange figures. A small number of examples will suffice.

Here is one whose strangeness has at least a certain poetic flavour. The horses of Indra are compared to wings that carry an eagle,⁴ VIII, 34, 9. The team of the *Ásvins* being often composed of birds, it is, by a figure perhaps still more singular, these birds that become their wings while they themselves are compared to eagles, V, 74, 9. Why then should Grassmann who has translated these formulae pretty faithfully, obliterate the same

¹ *La Religion Védique d'après les hymnes du Rgveda*, Vol. 1.

² Pischel, *Göttingische Anzeigen*, 1879, p. 170.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ The *Maruts* on their chariot drawn by horses are also compared to eagles, VIII, 20, 10.

figure in verse VI, 47, 31 in his translation which is more in conformity with our own taste than with the text which he interprets ? This text in fact, does not say merely that 'the warriors fly on their horses,' but that they take 'their horses' for 'wings.'

In the verse X, 180, 2, Indra is compared to a terrible animal. At the same time, there presents itself before the poet the image of a chariot with a sharp wheel which grinds the enemies, and the sharp wheel of the hero becomes the jaw of the animal: "Like the terrible animal dwelling in the mountain which glides slowly, thou hast come from the most distant region; [3] sharpening like a jaw, the sharp felly of the wheel, O Indra, grind the enemies, chase the malefactors. "

The following comparisons are still more bizarre. The poet with his hymn turns Indra (in order to make him roll towards himself) as the carpenter turns a wheel, VII, 32, 20. The singers place their desire on Indra like a foot in a chariot (in order that it may take them to the goal), VII, 32, 2. The prayer is compared to a girth which grips Indra and Soma like two horses, VII, 104, 6. Indra is filled with chants as a stable with cows, VIII, 24, 6. We shall have to revert more than once to the assimilation of the chants with cows. The whole world knows, moreover, what an important role the cow plays in Vedic phraseology. The beneficent deity par excellence, Indra, is compared to a cow that allows herself to be milked, VIII, 82, 3; Val. 4, 4. The god who unites in himself the principle attributes of Providence, and who, in particular, observes the most secret faults, Varuna, protects the thoughts of men, like cows, VIII, 41, 1.

I could continue thus for a long time. The juices of Soma, when they have been ingurgitated, fight in the heart, like drunken men, VIII, 2, 12.² When Indra soaks himself with them, the author of the hymn X, 43 compares them not only to rivers that

¹ सुक This meaning seems to me justified by the analogy of *srkva*, *srkvan*, 'corner of the mouth' (in classical Sanskrit), and by the comparison of verse I, 32, 12, in which सुक is used a second time with the verse IV, 18, 9 in which the word हन is used.

² The second simile contained in this verse is very obscure.

fill a pool (verse 7), but to birds that are going to perch upon a thick tree (verse 4). The simples that heal a sick person are compared to victorious mares that break through the malady X, 97, 3.

But, more curious, sometimes, than the strangeness of the text itself are the expedients to which the interpreters have recourse in order to escape it. Indra 'carries his puissance like a hook', X, 134, 6, without doubt in order to draw to himself the branch of the celestial tree, *ibid.* Who could have expected to see Ludwig and Grassmann have recourse to a word *śakti*, 'lance', of which there is no trace in the Vedic texts,¹ in order to end in the idea, which is moreover no less bizarre, of a god carrying his lance like a hook?

INVERSE COMPARISONS

There is more than one simile whose words occupy a place which is inverse to that which, in our eyes, appertains to them. Thus the comparison of rivers to horses that run, does not astonish us. The comparison of horses however, [4] with rivers, VI, 46, 14, appears to be very strange. It is nevertheless capable of explanation. The rivers, like the waters in general, play such a great role in Vedic phraseology.

The sound of the pressing-stone is often compared to the chant of the priest. Inversely, we read in the verse V, 36, 4, that the 'singer' raises the voice 'like the stone'.

The comparison of prayers to teams is very frequent: the prayers thus become in a way the type of teams, and a poet compares the teams of the gods to prayers: "When wilt thou yoke thy team like prayers?", VI, 35, 3. The position of the particle of comparison, *na*, does not allow of any other interpretation. This however does not prevent Grassmann from translating, "When wilt thou yoke the prayers like horses?"

The sacred speech is all powerful in the sky. It is therefore comprehensible why its power is compared to that of the gods. None but a Vedic poet however would think of saying of a god, of Indra, that he is 'powerful like the speech', VIII, 46, 14. This, however, is no reason why the translators of this verse dis-

¹ In the verse II, 39, 7, Ludwig gives the correct interpretation.

figure an expression that is perfectly clear by interpretations that are as far removed from each other as from the text which they claim to explain.¹

In the verse I, 124, 4, we read that the Dawn 'has caused to appear like Nodhas, all that men desire'. This passage has put all the interpreters to torture; or rather, it is the name, in itself quite inoffensive, of *Nodhas*, that these same have tortured in order to extort from it a meaning which they suppose to be hidden in it. Let the reader however reassure himself: I shall cite here the conjectures of the three principal interpreters only. The word signifies according to Roth² 'merchants', and according to Grassmann, 'young girl'. Ludwig, finally, sees in it two different words³ and extracts from them a meaning that is as strange as any that can be proposed.⁴ It would be very much more simple to take the word for what it is, that is to say, as the name, known from other passages, of an ancient sacrificer. The priests procure wealth to those that employ them. They can therefore be compared to the Dawn who brings to mortals the treasure of light. The poet has only reversed the comparison here.

DOUBLE COMPARISONS

[5] Sometimes also the Vedic poets, in their comparisons, kill, as we say, two birds with one stone. Two ideas, each of which is often compared with a third, are compared with each other through the medium of a metaphor which replaces the two former similes. The latter, thus, in a way, serve as premises for a conclusion which is the new comparison.

This will be made more clear by examples. Here are two which I have already mentioned together elsewhere.⁵ The prayers

¹ Grassmann: "Im wahren Sinne des Wortes, kräftigen." Ludwig: "wie (meine) Rede (es vermag)." Does not Ludwig himself interpret a similar formula in the verse X, 50, 4 in the sense that Indra is 'the prayer par excellence', being thus more correct on this occasion than Grassmann?

² *Siebenzig Lieder des Rgveda, übersetzt von Geldner und Kaegi*, pp. 35 and 37, note 2.

³ न and ऊधर्

⁴ "Nicht wie ein Euter liez sie (doch) Liebes sehen."

⁵ *Religion Vedique*, I, pp. vi and vii and note, and previous to it, *Revue Critique*, 1875, II, p. 373, note 3.

⁹ [*Annals*, B. O. R. I.]

of different men are the branches of the same tree. The favours which the god distributes among men are also branches of the same trunk. Hence this third comparison which comprises the two former. "The favours of Indra ramify like prayers," VI, 44, 6. Again, the prayers are teams that bring the gods to the sacrifice or that carry the man to the goal which he pursues. But the riches that one appropriates are also teams that can be guided according to one's will. This is the origin of the formula, "I yoke the riches of men like my prayers," VIII, 19, 33. In these two passages, Grassmann has, without any reason, abandoned the true meaning of the word *vip* 'prayer.' Ludwig seems to have understood both formulae; only, he has committed the mistake of obliterating the metaphor in the second and has thus made it difficult to comprehend the comparison.

Here is another example of the same type. The diffusion of light is often compared to the effusion of a liquid. The composition of the hymn is assimilated to the clarification of the sacred beverage. The two comparisons are combined into one in the following formula which seems at first sight to be devoid of meaning: "Agni, whose flames are clarified like sounds," X, 3, 5. I refer to the translation of Ludwig, and especially to that of Grassmann, the reader who is curious to learn to how many improbable hypotheses about the meanings of words that are most clear, the strangeness of various figures of speech can lead the most competent interpreters.

A double comparison seems likewise to be implied by the bizarre metaphor which makes *butter* the *tongue* of the gods,' IV, 58, 1. The tongue of the gods is, ordinarily, Agni as [6] it is by means of the sacrificial fire that the gods consume the offering. Now the butter can be compared to the fire in so far as all the offerings have to be preceded and followed by an offering of butter which seems therefore to envelope the principal offering and thus becomes a new intermediary between this offering and the deity for whom it is destined.

¹ Grassmann translates correctly without giving any explanation. Ludwig seems, as if he would avoid, by means of a forced construction, the application of this formula to the butter.

BOLDNESS OF METAPHORS

We have pointed out the boldness of the Vedic similes. When these become implicit and are reduced to mere metaphors, the strangeness can more easily conduce to obscurity. The rays of the sun are compared to horses. It is necessary to have this idea present in the mind in order to comprehend the formula: "The rays of the sun draw him," I, 50, 1. The Maruts, when shaking the sky, make brilliant figs fall down from it, V, 54, 12. This is because the sky is sometimes conceived as a tree, whose fruits are the celestial treasures, rain or light.

It is said of the dead burnt on the funeral pyre that they are 'cooked'.¹ Again, the sun is a strainer with brilliant filaments who filters the light as the sacrificial strainer the Soma juice.² The reader to whom these ideas are unfamiliar can hardly understand that in the verse IX, 83, 12, the 'cooked ones' that alone can reach 'the strainer with brilliant filaments' at which the 'raw ones' do not arrive, represent the dead going to inhabit the sun.

To pardon sins, is in the Vedic language as in ours, to 'deliver' one from them. But the ṛṣis do not content themselves with this metaphor. They compare the sinner to a calf or a cow that is 'tied', IV, 12, 6. It is this which explains the following prayer: "Release us, O Agni, from the stable of the gods and from that of the mortals," IV, 12, 5. The allusion seems to have escaped Grassmann and Ludwig who arbitrarily assign to the word *ṛṣi* 'stable,'³ the meaning of 'prison'.

It is certainly a gracious figure that makes of the lightning a smile of the sky. It is again necessary to know that this figure is familiar to the Vedic poets in order to understand the comparison of Agni, the celestial fire, to the sky 'smiling across the

¹ *Religion Vedique*, I, pp. 79 and 80.

² *Ibid.*, p. 201.

³ See, regarding other, most curious, uses of this word, pp. 11 and 18. It is no longer necessary to change its meaning in the verses III, 1, 14; IV, 50, 2 (where however Ludwig retains the meaning of stable abandoned by Grassmann), nor in the verse II, 13, 7, nor in VII, 76, 5, where the fathers are represented as 'united with the Dawns in their stable.'

cloud,' II, 4, 6, [7] and specially the allusion¹ contained in this formula: "Agni, who makes the smile of all sacrifices," IV, 7, 3. The 'smile' of the sacrifice is the lightning itself in the verse VIII, 78, 6, the sacrifice in question being the celestial sacrifice: "When thou art born, O Indra, then are born the sacrifice, the hymn and the smile."

Indra, when he becomes intoxicated with the sacred beverage in the company of Viṣṇu, receives with this god, the, to our eyes, very irreverent appellation of 'jug of Soma', VI, 69, 2 and 6. An allusion to the same figure seems to be contained in this formula which is still more bold: "To milk the Soma into the stomach of Indra", IX, 72, 2. Here Grassmann translates correctly and it is Ludwig who weakens the figure by substituting the natural expression 'to cause to run' for the figurative expression 'to milk'.

We have already seen that the sound of the pressing stones is considered to be like a prayer. Hence the stones that speak, V, 31, 12.² The hymn X, 94, dedicated to the pressing-stones, begins thus: "May they speak, may we also speak. Speak to the stones that speak". By adding to this figure a metonymy, that is, by understanding the stone as the sound which it makes, we arrive at the bizarre formula of the verses X, 64, 15 and X, 100, 8: "The stone has said".³

The assimilation of the prayer to an offering 'is the key to the understanding of expressions like 'pouring out the hymn', VIII, 52, 4. It is the more astonishing that this formula should have brought Grassmann⁵ to a standstill since this scholar correctly translates the verse VIII, 39, 3: "O Agni, I throw these prayers, like butter, into thy mouth", and the verse II, 27, 1: "I pour out with the spoon in honour of the Ādityas these chants dripping with butter".⁶

¹ It has escaped Grassmann.

² And *passim*. See *Religion Védique*, I, p. 281.

³ Grassmann acquits himself of the affair, as he frequently does, by substituting for the figurative expression the word 'resounds.' Ludwig has recourse to a construction which seems to be very forced.

⁴ *Religion Védique*, I, p. 283.

⁵ He translates 'Sängers Ruf'.

⁶ Cf. I, 61, 5.

The Vedic poets are not content with comparing the recitation of the hymns to the throwing of the offering in the fire; they compare the composition with the preparation of the Soma offering.¹ As the prayer, moreover, procures all riches, it can be said of Agni, the poet par excellence, that he 'clarifies a very nourishing hymn', VII, 9, 2. Ludwig and Grassmann escape very cheaply from the difficulty presented by this passage [8] by giving to the substantive² a meaning which it does not have in the Vedic hymns, and to the verb,³ a meaning that exists in mere fancy.

It is said further of the same Agni that he has clarified the hymn⁴ through three strainers, III, 26, 8. When this god is conceived, not as the author, but merely as the inspirer of the prayer, the poets become the strainers through which he clarifies his thought,⁵ III, 1, 5. The prayers⁶ themselves distil a sweet liquor when passing through the poets as through strainers, III, 31, 16. It is also said that the sages clarify speech through an extended strainer through which pass thousands of drops, IX, 73, 7. To

¹ *Religion Vedique*, I, p. 283.

² अ॒र्क 'sun'; see *Religion Vedique*, I, p. 279 and note.

³ पु॒ना॒नः Grassmann, 'flammend aufthat'; Ludwig: 'rein darstellend.'

⁴ Again अ॒र्क which Ludwig continues to translate as 'sun.' He will explain later on the 'three purifications of the sun.' Grassmann disposes of the matter at once by giving to the word पु॒वि॒त्र 'strainer,' the meaning of 'entflammen' (sic).

⁵ Ludwig's translation, 'heilig darstellend seine geistige Kraft durch die Reinigungsmittel der göttlichen Weisen' is not very clear. Grassmann has not hesitated to make a mere adjective of क॒वि॒भिः; Ludwig too does so, moreover, in the verses III, 31, 16. See the next note.

⁶ Denoted by the word ध॒नु॒त्री which occurs again only once, in IX, 93, 1 and as an epithet of the prayers. म॒ध्वः is a partitive genitive used here with पु॒ना॒नाः as it frequently is with the verb प॒ा 'to drink'. It is the prayers which cause the waters to move (*hinvarianti* can have only a transitive meaning). Grassmann and Ludwig have not troubled themselves about making the translation of this passage accord with that of the preceding one.

learn the verses which celebrate Soma Pavamāna¹ is to learn 'the juice prepared by the ṛsis', IX, 67, 31. Finally, the *tongue distils* the sweet *liquour* of the sacrifice,² IX, 75, 2, and at its extremity is a strainer, IX, 73, 9. We shall meet below³ with this last idea in combination with a different figure.

"To weave the work of the singers", X, 53, 6, is another metaphor which recalls by way of allusion the comparison of the prayer with a textile, with a garment, which the singers weave for the gods.

The prayer is also conceived as a weapon, whence the metaphor, to 'whet the prayer', VIII, 42, 3. The weapon of the prayer is employed by the gods themselves. If this idea had been present in their minds, Grassmann and Ludwig, would have, in spite of the example of Roth, understood that there is no occasion to abandon⁴ [9] the meaning of prayer, which is the only justifiable⁵ meaning, in order to explain the formula: "Trita struck the boar with a prayer which had a point of iron", X, 99, 6. The prayer with the iron point recalls moreover the hymns⁶ which 'glow like the fire' X, 68, 6.

It is said to Indra: "Do not stay in the evening away from us like a bad son-in-law", VIII, 2, 20. This is a comparison which is not more unusual than many others. One does not, however, understand it fully, if one fails to see in it an allusion to the

¹ And not the prayers 'that clarify themselves' as I have said elsewhere (*Religion Vedique*, I, p. 283) through a *lapsus*, confusing the derivative प्रावमानी with the present participle of the verb *pu*.

² Or, more correctly, 'of the law.' I do not believe that the genitive ऋतस्य should be construed with जिह्वा, as Grassmann and Ludwig have done, and still less, that the tongue in question can be Soma. Such a figure can be explained by no analogy. On the other hand, it is clearly Soma who is the 'lord' or 'spouse' of the prayer, and who moreover, himself also speaks.

³ Pp. 26-27.

⁴ Grassmann: 'Pfeil.' Ludwig: 'Schleuder'.

⁵ See above, p. 5, note 1.

⁶ Again अर्क Grassmann: 'Glute,' Ludwig: 'Blitz.' See p. 8, notes 1 and 3.

idea that the prayer is the spouse, the young wife, *ibid.* 19,¹ of the god. In this way is also explained the presence in a hymn addressed to Indra, of a formula like that of the verse V, 37, 3: "This woman goes searching for a husband that will espouse her". In the same way also when the Vedic poets show us Agni VII, 10, 1, or Soma, VI, 47, 3, *awakening* the prayer which *readily* awakes, it requires on the part of the reader some familiarity with the conceptions which are peculiar to them to see there an allusion to the spouse or the lover (female) awakened by the husband or the lover.²

The prayer is, again, a chariot that brings the gods to the sacrifice. The Vedic *ṛsis* therefore *carpenter* prayers, VI, 32, 1.³ The poet, fearing that other sacrificers may compete with him and invoke the god at the same time as he, addresses himself in these words to Indra: "Let our hymn be the one that *conveys* thee the best," VI, 45, 30. From this translation to that of Ludwig and from Ludwig's to Grassmann's, there can be observed a gradual effacement of the figure. Ludwig says, "Let this be the one that *draws* thee the best," and Grassmann: "Let this be the one that *charms* thee the most." We may also cite in this connection the formula: "Let us make for Indra a pleasing chariot," III, 53, 3. Grassmann gives to the word वाहस् directly the meaning 'praise': in doing so, he is only following the *Nirukta*. The hymn of praise may be thus named because it brings the god; but there is here one of the numerous cases where the question of rhetoric is wrongly treated as a question of lexicography. The word वाहस् denotes 'chariot' and suggests the idea of 'prayer.'⁵

¹ "Come towards us like the great man who has married a young wife," that is to say, like a powerful or rich son-in-law. The second pāda seems to be a sort of parenthesis. Ludwig, it seems to me, has totally misunderstood the meaning of this passage.

² Compare, regarding उशती, X, 63, 1, and regarding अजीग्र I, 134, 3. The allusion has, without doubt, escaped the two translators.

³ And *passim*.

⁴ Cf. the use of the word वाहस् in the compounds स्तोमवाहस्, ब्रह्मवाहस्, and सिन्धुवाहस् and likewise the parallel use of the adjective वाहिष्ठ, applied sometimes to the *hymn*, as above VI, 45, 30, sometimes to the *rivers*, VIII, 26, 18, and sometimes to the *chariot*, VII, 37, 1.

⁵ Ludwig substitutes, without any apparent reason, another metaphor, 'Hebe'.

[10] The assimilation of prayers to horses belongs to the same category of ideas. Of Agni the inspirer of hymns, it is said that he helps 'in yoking the prayers,'¹ I, 18, 7. Sometimes it is the god invoked who himself yokes the prayers, that is, who takes them for his team: "The men invoke Indra that he may yoke the prayers which he rescues," VII, 27, 1. Ludwig and Grassmann obliterate this metaphor in their translations. Both have totally mistranslated verse 13 of the hymn VIII, 5, addressed to the *Āsvins*, where the same idea is expressed as, 'yoke the prayer of men and come quick.' And yet, the verb used, *ni yaviṣṭam*, is precisely the one whose formation corresponds to that of the substantive *niyut*. Now this word is so often used to denote the prayers that Grassmann, substituting, as he frequently does, the suggested idea to the idea expressed, assigns directly to it the meaning 'prayer' in his lexicon, although in reality it has the meaning of 'team' only. The numerous uses of the same word in a metaphorical sense can, for the rest, furnish us with a whole series of allusions in addition to those that have just been mentioned. I shall content myself with citing one of them. We have seen Indra compared to a wheel that rolls towards the sacrificer. The author of the verse IV, 31, 4 reproduces this comparison, adding however that it is the teams of men that make him roll. These teams are evidently the prayers. Here the true meaning has escaped Ludwig: it has been grasped by Grassmann who however commits the mistake of substituting the idea of 'prayers' for 'teams'.

The figure that is perhaps the most used and whose applications are the most diverse in the *Rgveda* is that of the 'cow'. It denotes in particular the prayers,² and the metaphor is so well-known that a poet alludes to it in the following manner: "I have brought thee these hymns of praise like a cowherd", I, 14, 9³. Elsewhere, through a peculiarity similar to that which I have denoted by the name of 'Inverse Comparison,' it is the *upameya* which occurs in the simile: "I have somehow brought thee the cows; accept them, O night, daughter of the sky, like the praise

¹ Ludwig and Grassmann have effaced the metaphor.

² *Religion Védique*, I, p. 309.

³ Cf. VI, 49, 12 below, p. 19.

which is addressed to the conqueror," X, 127, 8. The translation which Ludwig gives of this verse is not very intelligible. Grassmann gets rid of the bizarrerie by giving to the words their natural order ; but in doing so, he has been obliged to reverse that in which it has pleased the poet to present them to us.

Indra's appellation as the ' bull of the prayers,' ¹VI, 17, 2, is to be explained in the same way. Similarly, it is possible that an allusion of the same kind [II] is contained in the invitation which is addressed to Indra in VIII, 88, 1 to 'approach the stable.' For the idea of 'stable,' Ludwig substitutes the vague one of 'habitation.' Grassmann translates 'drinks,' and in fact it is possible that by the word 'stable' the poet alludes to the offerings, which, like the prayers, are also represented as cows ; but he should have, in any case, preserved the metaphor.

The substitution of 'milk' for 'cow' in representing the prayer leads naturally to the substitution of the idea of cow for that of 'cowherd' in representing the poet. It is thus that the author of the verse I, 186, 4 is able to compare himself to a 'cow', ² a good milker, when he composes his 'hymn'. Here it is the text which Grassmann has disturbed; he substitutes a dual for the singular in order to connect the qualification 'cow' with the 'Night' and the 'Dawn' to whom the verse is addressed.

Finally, one should bear well in mind that the cow is the type of all the gifts that man expects from the gods in order to understand this strange comparison: "Our desire is opened like a stable ;³ fill it, O Indra, thou that art the lord of riches", III, 30, 19.

INCOHERENT COMBINATIONS OF FIGURATIVE AND UNFIGURATIVE WORDS

The obscurity of metaphors is lessened, when, by the side of the figurative word, there occurs, as is the case in a great number

¹ Ludwig gets rid of this combination in a very artificial manner by understanding an idea which nothing suggests, 'Der Stier, (der Gegenstand) der Lieder.' Grassmann translates more faithfully ; but there is nothing to indicate that he has understood the allusion.

² Cf. I, 187, 11.

³ Ludwig translates correctly. Grassmann substitutes another metaphor 'Meeresbecken' for that of the text, Cf. p. 6, note 3.

of the examples already cited, an unfigurative word which determines its application. But, in return, the bizarrerie is enhanced when this unfigurative word expresses a detail which is strange in connection with the idea represented by the figure, or even irreconcilable with it.

To kindle Agni is to awaken him: the metaphor is natural. It is less natural when Agni is 'awakened' with 'a billet of wood,' V, 1, 1. The fire devours: nothing more simple. But what formula is so bizarre as the following where it is a simile which suggests the metaphor while the principal sentence contains only the unfigurative word: "Thou burnest the wood, O Agni, like cattle in the pasturage," V, 9, 4 ?¹ Agni's flame is a tongue. This tongue digests the offering. It is more strange that it breaks the stones, VIII, 61, 4. Similarly, one can understand the flames being called [12] spoons when they present the offering to the gods. But this figure is used in sentences where it cannot be explained, in VI, 66, 10, where the Maruts, impetuous like flames, are compared to the spoons² of Agni.

The priest who has drunk the Soma juice and whose body has thus become the abode of a god, calls himself an 'ornate mansion.' This does not prevent him from representing himself at the same time as 'going and carrying the offering to the gods,' X, 119, 13.³ This figure has displeased Grassmann and Ludwig and they have sacrificed to their offended taste, one the lexicography, and the other, the grammar. The former gives to a word which denotes 'house' the meaning of 'servant'; the latter translates a nominative⁴ as an accusative and another nominative⁵ as the genitive of a word whose accent does not permit it to be confounded with the word actually used.

¹ Cf. VI, 2, 9.

² जुहू Ludwig and Grassmann change the meaning of the word and say 'the tongues of Agni'; see below, p. 14, note 2.

³ *Religion Vedique*, I, p. 151.

⁴ गृहो Does Ludwig believe, like Kaegi, *Siebenzig Lieder*, p. 83, note 4 that this form stands for गृहं उ ? In my view, the one is equivalent to the other.

⁵ अरंकृतो and not अरंकृतो.

Soma himself is a combatant : he fights the demons. But, as it is the arms of the priests which make the Soma juice run when pressing it with stones, Soma is 'a combatant who is made to move with the arms'¹ V, 58, 4. In the verse IX, 96, 19, Soma is called at the same time a 'drop' that carries weapons and wins cows and an 'eagle' staying in the 'vat'. In another passage, X, 101, 10, where the epithet 'bay' and specially the figure of the ten straps (the ten fingers) which grip imply the assimilation of Soma to a horse, the poet says, without troubling himself about the incoherence² of his language, 'Throw the bay into the vat,' and he adds, alluding to the sacrifice of the horse, 'fashion him with knives;' but these knives are 'made of stones,' because they are the pressing-stones. Again, it is Soma who is called in the verse V, 50, 4, the 'animal of the vat'. This combination of words has appeared too dry to Grassmann who replaces 'vat' by 'manger.'

When representing Soma as a bull, the poet has felt no scruple about making him liquid and has thus made a 'drop bull' of him, VI, 41, 3. Then, with the addition to the metaphor of a metonymy, it is said that the plant (for the Soma juice, that is extracted from it) [13] lows, IX, 74, 5. This formula becomes, in the translation of Grassmann, 'the juice bubbles'.

Soma on the one hand is a calf; on the other, he comes out of a plant. He is therefore a calf whom Parjanya, his father, makes a 'foetus of the plants', III, 101, 1. Ludwig translates correctly this formula, the figure in which is obliterated by Grassmann.

To press out any juice is, in Vedic phraseology, to milk it out. Therefore the Soma is said to be milked; but he is 'milked' with 'stones', the pressing stones, I, 54, 9; VIII, 38, 3; IX, 80, 5. Here it is Grassmann who has preserved the figure while Ludwig has effaced it.

The Soma in the sky is identified with the sun. He is therefore represented as 'looking down below', but the poet continues and calls him a 'liquor', IX, 38, 5.

¹ बाहुजूत This epithet which is related to बाहुच्युत and अद्रिजूत, does not permit of any doubt that it is Soma who is spoken of in this verse. Grassmann and Ludwig, without troubling themselves with these analogies, translate here, the former, 'armgewandt' and the latter, 'armkräftig.'

² Regarding the incoherence of the figures, see the whole hymn and especially verses 2, 7, and 11.

On the other hand, the liquor which gives to Indra the strength that he requires for accomplishing his divine exploits can pass for the bolt of Indra. This is the 'intoxicating bolt' which has been given to him by Kāvya Uśana, and which the new priest again forges for him, I, 121, 12. Grassmann translates 'the joyful lightning' and Ludwig 'the bolt which is pleasing to him'. Neither the one nor the other seems to have comprehended that the bolt given to a god by a priest can only be a liturgical weapon.

But we have better than the 'intoxicating' bolt. It is the hammer explicitly called 'hammer of the pressed liquor', that Indra 'causes to flow into his stomach', X, 116, 4. We find again here the confusion of the idea of 'weapon' and that of 'drink'. Nothing however of all this in the translations of Grassmann and Ludwig.¹

Elsewhere, it is Indra himself who 'causes to flow' on the demon, by means of 'stones', a 'bolt' representing Soma, V, 48, 3. Grassmann translates correctly this passage; it is Ludwig who has effaced the figure.

Soma is also the prop of the sky. It would seem that the first quality required in a prop should be solidity. The author of the verse IX, 86, 46, says nevertheless: "It has spread, the liquor that is the prop of the sky".

It is Soma that attracts Indra, that makes him come down upon the altar. It can therefore be said that he yokes his horses. Everything goes well so long as Soma is represented with a human form. But, when the poet places him in the cup, or even substitutes by metonymy for the liquor the 'cup' which 'yokes the horses' *hāriyojana*, I, 82, 4 the combination of ideas becomes very [14] strange. Nevertheless it would be better to admit this than to essay the forced constructions to which Grassmann and Ludwig have recourse. The error of the latter is the more peculiar inasmuch as in a very analogous formula where it is merely the priests instead of the cup that yoke the horses of Indra, I, 61, 16, he does not hesitate, in order to bring out the meaning of the same word, *हारियोजन* to make in the text a correction² which looks very

¹ The meaning of the root *vr̥ṣ* in the middle with the prefix *ā*, has not appeared sufficiently established to them to discourage them from searching for another.

² By rejecting firstly the reading of the Pada-pāṭha, and then changing the accentuation of the Saṁhitā.

seductive in my eyes, but which condemns his former interpretation.

These however are but some out of the thousands of examples of *bizarrierie* that are furnished by the formulae relating to Soma. Book IX of the R̥gveda, consisting solely of hymns addressed to Soma Pavamāna is wholly in this style.

I have already referred above to the assimilation of the prayer to the offering. When the offering is a prayer, the spoon is naturally the tongue of the poet. It is in this sense that the formula, "I eloquently invoke Agni with the spoon", II, 10, 6, should be understood. But interpreting is one thing, and translating, another; and Grassmann in his dictionary,¹ and Ludwig in his translation, are wrong in substituting the idea of 'tongue' for that of 'spoon'.

In the hymn IV, 56 concerning the sacrificial butter, the drops of butter placed 'in the heart', 11, purified 'with the heart,' 6, coming out from 'the ocean of the heart,' 5, can be only the prayers. But it must in any case be admitted that the metaphor is harsh. The 'ocean of the heart' is not found either in Ludwig or in Grassmann. The former substitutes for it 'the inmost vessel' which has not much meaning. The latter is clear, but at what a price! The ocean becomes a 'pleasing' ocean, that of the atmosphere. Neither the one nor the other has taken any pains to make his translation of verse 5 accord with that of 6 and 11.

Conversely, the flowing of the deified waters is assimilated to a chant: "Sing us," they are addressed, "milk out of fat, sweet milk," X, 64, 9. Grassmann replaces here the idea of 'singing'² with that of 'sending'.

The sacred speech is the first of all things. In particular, it is the mother of the different couples of gods, X, 125, 1. The author of the verse III, 39, 3 (of. 1 and 2), while calling it 'the mother of twins,' has not hesitated to add that it is placed [15]

¹ In his translation, he is far off from the true meaning. The article in the dictionary on the imaginary word जुह 'tongue' contains however a just observation on the confusion of the idea of spoon and that of 'tongue' applied to the flames of Agni. See above, p. 12, note 1.

² On the meaning of the verb *rc*, see *Religion Védique*, I, p. 277.

'on the mobile extremity of the tongue.' Nothing of this however is found either in Grassmann or Ludwig.¹

The invocation to Agni : "Give attention to every one that has a good chariot," III, 14, 7, evidently needs explanation. To say like Ludwig "Be the ally² of every one that has a good war-chariot" is to content oneself too easily, and not to interpret it. The possession of a good war chariot is not, obviously, a special title to the favour of the gods. The chariot in question is the prayer³ that brings the gods to the sacrifice. I could have already cited this passage above ; but the imperative *bodhi* 'pay attention' would very naturally require the complement 'to our prayer,' so that I thought that I should include the combination 'pay attention to him who has a good chariot' among those which present an incoherence between the figurative and unfigurative words.

There are however, belonging to the same category, many combinations that are strange. Ludwig has not shrunk from 'the eloquent chariot,' I, 112, 2, which has scared away Grassmann. The 'eloquent ship,' II, 16, 7, has, I do not know why, scared away not only Grassmann⁴ but Ludwig also. The 'ship of prayers' is, nevertheless, a known figure, I, 46, 7.

¹ The lexicography and the grammar (accentuation of पतत्) have been equally maltreated in the translation of Ludwig : "Der Zunge Spitze senkte sich und hob sich". Grassmann's only mistake is in giving to the two different propositions two different subjects both of which are drawn from his imagination. It is the same element of Vedic liturgy and mythology that is spoken of in verse 6 of the hymn VI, 59 addressed to a pair of deities, to Indra and Agni : "She who is without feet advances before those who have feet ; she comes out from the head ; with the tongue, she speaks, she walks, etc." Here the accent of वावदत् may be explained as due to a sort of subordination of this verb to those that follow. The unexpected translations that Grassmann and Ludwig give of this new formula are as far removed from each other as each of them is from mine.

² Ludwig is however obliged to understand the word 'ally' with *bodhi*, taken as the imperative of *bhū*. This form is here, as understood by Grassmann, the imperative of *budh*.

³ Or the sacrifice in general. It is thus that Grassmann, in his dictionary, seems to understand this passage. His translation, without explanation, is correct.

⁴ Only at the time of translation. In his dictionary, he gives the correct meaning.

The prayers are also horses. It is also said therefore that they 'caracole,'¹ and that they caracole when coming out from 'the heart,' II, 39, 1.

We have seen the gods take for their team² the prayers of [16] men. But these teams of prayers go to meet them. The poet 'sends' to the gods a 'desire' well 'yoked', IV, 23, 5³. All 'the teams pursue' the Ásvins, VII, 72, 1.⁴ The figurative and the unfigurative words are used together⁵ in this passage of a hymn to Indra: "Like water that follows its slope, the chants, the prayers, the teams,⁶ run towards thee," VI, 47, 14. Horses that themselves go seeking him whom they have to carry are, in the first place, rare horses. What can we say of those that call him? It has been seen above that Agni helps in yoking the prayers. Elsewhere, he is prayed to himself yoke, like a driver, 'the horses which best call'⁷ the gods', VIII, 64, 1.

¹ I, 142, 4; VI, 22, 5; X, 148, 5. This is the correct meaning of the root *vac*. It explains particularly well the passages where this root is used to denote the flowing of the Soma who is so often compared to a horse. In his interpretations of the word वक्त्रं Ludwig is not consistent. See VI, 22, 5 and I, 144, 6.

² Cf. X, 47, 7. Grassmann is wrong in referring the form वच्यमान to the root *vac* 'to speak'.

³ Here it is Grassmann who translates correctly. It is however possible that the verb signifies 'to weave' as understood by Ludwig. We would then have a combination of two incoherent metaphors. But Ludwig's translation: "festverbundene Liebe" seems to us to be pure fantasy.

⁴ Ludwig translates 'follow' in spite of the prefix अभि. Here it is Grassmann who seems to me to have understood the correct meaning.

⁵ Cf. VIII, 85, 10: "Send to Indra the hymn, the troops, the chants" and I, 145, 3: "Towards him (Agni) go the spoons, the mares." In the second passage which takes us back to the figure of teams, the mares are the prayers rather than the beverages as believed by Grassmann. As for Ludwig's translation, 'die Trefflichen,' it is as arbitrary as it is devoid of sense.

⁶ Ludwig, contrary to his habit, adds to the translation of the word नियुत् an explanation in parenthesis. But this explanation, 'Aufträge,' is inadmissible.

⁷ This figure has quite disappeared in Grassmann's translation.

Indra mounts his chariot 'at the call' of his bay horses, 'III, 45, 2. Ludwig, it is true, interprets this call as a simple neighing; and, in fact, the two bay horses do constitute the celestial team of Indra. Still it is the more easy to admit here a confusion between this team and the liturgical team of prayers inasmuch as we read in the verse III, 50, 2: "I yoke for thee the two pious horses whose piety thou hast rewarded long ago."

In the hymn II, 18, the horses that call Indra are in number successively 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 (verse 4), 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70 (verse 5), 80, 90, 100 (verse 6). Grassmann and Ludwig translate 'called with 2, 4, etc., horses.'² They have not comprehended that all these horses, or rather, all these *pairs* of horses, are liturgical teams. And yet the chariot of verse 1 can represent only the sacrifice. It is said in verse 3 that the two bay horses of Indra are yoked by the prayer. Finally, verse 7 says quite categorically, "Come, O Indra, in the direction of my [17] prayers; yoke them all³ like the two bay horses to the yoke of the chariot." And why this ever increasing number of horses? The sequel of the same verse explains it to us: "For, thou mayest be invoked in many different places." The multiplication of the number of horses is like a higher bid by means of which the poet hopes to induce the god to resolve to listen to him in preference to other sacrificers.

But we have not yet arrived at the last limits of the bizarrerie. The horses that draw the gods, the chariot wheels that are turned for them, are well-known equivalents of the prayers, so that, instead of saying, as in the verse VI, 48, 16, 'to speak' to the ear of the god, the poet says, 'May the horses, O Indra and Kutsa, draw you at the ear'⁴ V, 31, 9 or 'The priests, while invoking the ram (Indra), draw a chariot-wheel at his ear,' VIII, 86, 12.

¹ Grassmann's translation is totally different. But the meaning which he gives to अ॒भि॒स्व॒रे 'behind,' is only a conjecture and is as venturesome as futile.

² Note the parallelism of ह॒य॒मा॒नः and उ॒द्य॒मा॒नः in verses 4 and 6.

³ It is not possible to connect वि॒श्व॒ा and इ॒री as Grassmann and Ludwig have done.

⁴ Grassmann and Ludwig seek naturally another meaning for अ॒पि क॒र्णे, 'nah zur Stelle.' 'auf Hörweite'.

It will be observed, in connection with the assimilation of the prayers with horses that the priests also are horses that draw the sacrificial chariot. There are therefore horses that chant beautiful hymns, VII, 38, 7. The priests that are spoken of in this passage are however divine priests; and Grassmann and Ludwig remove the bizarrerie from the expression, the first by giving to the word अर्क 'hymn' the meaning of 'splendour,' the second by omitting to translate the word वाजिन् 'horse.'

We have also seven 'horses'² that 'speak' and that 'say' the truth only, that have only 'thoughts' conforming to the law; III, 4, 7. They are the seven mythical priests. The verse VII, 90, 5 also speaks of beings that 'draw' (a chariot) 'yoked'³ by their own will; and that have only 'thoughts' conforming to the truth.

Inversely, but chiefly by virtue of the same assimilation of the priests to horses, there are 'priests' that 'caracole,'⁴ III, 6 1. They are the 'horses with seven tongues' recalling the seven priests and the seven prayers, *ibid*, 2.

But let us turn back to the prayers. We know that they are also often compared to cows. Hence the 'cows' that approach; 'praying' to the lord of the cows, IX, 97; 34. The [18] formula that follows immediately in the same verse presents to us the same figure reversed: "The prayers go forward bellowing towards Soma." The two explain each other. We may also cite the verse X; 104, 10: "The cow invokes him who is much invoked." The author of the verse V, 18, 4 does not shrink from alluding to the assimilation of the prayers with cows even when placing the prayers in the mouth of the poets or singers: "The singers who guard the hymns in their mouth."

The Maruts when making the rain fall are said to 'milk' the inexhaustible spring, VIII, 7, 16. This is because, in reality, like the prayers, and according to all seeming even before them, the celestial waters are cows.

¹ See *Religion Védique*, I, p. 279 and note.

² Ludwig does not admit the meaning 'horse' given by Roth and Grassmann to the word पृक्ष. This meaning however seems to me to be probable. In any case, the assimilation of the priests with horses is established by a good number of passages.

³ This figure seems to have completely escaped Ludwig.

⁴ See above, p. 15, note 5.

¹¹ [Annals, B. O. R. I.]

The waters would be in place in a river and the cows in a stable; but the Vedic poets do not trouble themselves about analogy in the use which they make of sacred figures. Thus we meet in the verse IV, 19, 6 a 'river' containing all the 'cows.'¹ From the river full of cows, by transferring the figure from the contained to the container, one arrives easily at this formula: "The rain coming from the troop," X, 23, 4. One thinks oneself dreaming when one reads the 'translation' that Grassmann gives of this expression. "The hero and all his troop (sic)."

The confusion between cows and celestial rivers also explains perfectly the formula: "The rivers fill the same stable," II, 35, 3, without any necessity of changing, as do Grassmann and Ludwig, the meaning of 'stable'² into that of 'reservoir'.

The cow is also a commonplace symbol of the liberality of the god, and when the suppliant desires horses or even cows, it is this symbolical cow that he has to 'milk' in order to extract from it the 'cow' and the 'horse,' VIII, 14, 3.

JUXTAPOSITION OF DISPARATE SIMILES

Just as I said some words on the boldness of similes before speaking of the bizarrerie of the metaphors, I believe that I should, before speaking of the incoherent combinations of diverse metaphors, give some examples of the diversity of the similes employed concerning the same object and their juxtaposition in the same formula. Here is one that is very curious: "Like the cows towards the village; like the combatant towards his horses; like the cow towards her calf, good and allowing herself to be sucked, like a husband towards his [19] wife, may he come towards us, he who sustains the sky; Savitr who gives all riches," X, 149, 4.

The litanies to Indra are similar to those to Savitr: "Call here thy friend like a cow that one is going to milk;³ awaken, O singer, the lover Indra; like a vessel full of riches up to the brim, bring here the hero that he may make us presents," X, 42, 2.

¹ Concerning the word **धेनी** see below, p. 31, note 1.

² **कुर्व** See above, p. 6, note 3.

³ This interpretation, which in any case, thrusts itself, so to say, upon one would be facilitated by the emendation **दोहे न** proposed by Roth.

To the well-known figure which makes the prayer a cow, may be added that which makes it a garment, a parure of the god, in the following passage: "Lead them to the hero as a cowherd leads his herd to the stable; may he clothe himself with the prayers of the priests as of the starry sky," VI, 49, 12. In the verse V, 29, 15, the poet compares the prayers which he addresses to Indra to garments and to a chariot. In another passage, I, 186, 7, the prayers have at the same time three different representations: "Our prayers, which serve him as horses, lick him as cows lick their new-born calf. Our chants caress, as wives the most lovable hero." The three figures likewise combined in the verse X, 101, 2 are those of the garment which adorns, the boat which sails and the weapon which brings victory over the enemies: all the three denote alike the prayer: "Perform the pleasant works; stretch (the warp of) the prayers (in order to weave them); make the boat which transports with the aid of oars; make ready your weapons, prepare everything, lead, make the sacrifice come forward, friends." The application of these metaphors, or at least of the last one, seems to have escaped Grassmann and Ludwig; for they substitute for the idea of 'weapons' that of 'utensils'.¹

When the prayer is considered as a chariot that brings the god, the poet can say that he makes a 'hymn' like a 'carpenter'.² But the author of the verse III, 38, 1 does not stop here: he compares himself in addition to a horse yoked to the yoke.

The hymns to Soma of Book IX furnish us in abundance with a series of incongruous comparisons. We content ourselves with citing the verse IX, 82, 1. Soma is here called a horse that is 'pressed'; he is compared to a king when he neighs or bellows (just as one likes) after the cows and to an eagle when he passes through the strainer and stops in the vat.

[To be continued]

¹ It is necessary however to cite the whole hymn. It is full of mystical incoherences.

² The allusion seems however to have escaped Ludwig who gives to मनीषा the meaning of 'Gedanke' and explains it in parenthesis by 'Plan.'

MISCELLANEA

METHODS ADOPTED BY JAINA WRITERS FOR RECORDING THEIR OWN NAMES AND THOSE OF THEIR GURUS IN THE WORKS COMPOSED BY THEM

BY

Prof. H. R. KAPADIA, M. A.

Works can be classified in a number of ways. One of them is to divide them into two groups : (1) onymous and (2) anonymous. As regards the first group there are two alternatives, one wherein the author has himself mentioned his name and the other wherein the author's name is supplied later on by some one else. In the former case, it may be that the name is expressly mentioned by the author himself or that it may have been indirectly suggested by him. I intend to deal with, in this note mostly with the latter case. I shall begin with a Prākṛit work viz. *Viśeṣa-cunpi*¹ of Nisīhasutta composed by Jinadāsa Gaṇi Mahattara. There he has said in the end :—

“ ति-चउ-पण-अट्टमवग्ग ति-पण-ति-तिगअक्खरा व ते तेसिं ।

पढम-ततिपहिं ति-दुसरजुपहिं णामं कयं जस्स ॥

गुरुदिणं च गणित्तं, महत्तरत्तं च तस्स तुट्ठेहिं ॥

तेण कप्पा चुणी, विसेसनामा णिसीहस्स ॥ ”

The first of these verses gives us the name Jinadāsa. For, ज, क, च, ट, त, प, य and श are the eight *vargas*. The 3rd, 5th, 3rd and 3rd letters of the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 8th *vargas* are respectively ज, ण, द, and स. Out of them the first ज and the third द respectively combined with इ and आ, the 3rd and the 2nd letters of the first *varga* give us the name Jinadāsa.


Upadeśamālā known as Puṣpamālā, too, furnishes us with a similar example. The verse in question is as under :—

“ हेमनाजचंदद्वपुसिपिपिपढमवज्जनामे ॥

सिरिअमयसरिसीसेहिं विरइयं पगरणं इणमो ॥ ५०१ ॥ ”

¹ For some of the remarks regarding this work, see *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Vol. XVI, pts. III-IV ; pp. 299-300.

चक्रबन्धः



By combining the first letter of each of the words हेम, मणि, चंद, दप्पण, सूरि and रिसी we get the author's name Hemacanda Sūri.

In the two instances already noted, the clue to derive the name is given. Now, I shall refer to verses where such a clue does not seem to be specifically pointed out. Take the case of the following verse from Saṅghapattaka¹ of Jinavallabha Sūri.

“ विभ्राजिष्णुमगर्ध्वमस्मरमनासादं श्रुतोर्लघने
सज्ज्ञानयुमणिं जिनं वरवपुःश्रीचन्द्रिकाभेश्वरम् ।
वन्दे वर्णमनेकधा मुरनरैः शक्रेण चेनशिखदं
दम्भारिं विदुषां सदा मुवचसाऽनेकान्तरङ्गप्रदम् ॥ ३८ ॥ ”

This verse can be arranged as a *cakrabandha*² for which the reader is referred to the diagram facing this very page.

Somatilaka Sūri, too, has ingenuously suggested his name in the following verse :—

“ यस्त्वां श्रीजिन ! स्यादितोस्मदमनश्चोरः प्रणौति श्रमं
जित्वा सोढगरिष्टकष्टदहनं शोचिष्णुभालयुतम् ।
दत्ताऽमर्त्यपवित्रसंमद ! पठन् कान्तं विशङ्कः स्तवं
वन्द्यान्हाय भवान् जिनः प्रदत्तामन्येऽपि तस्मै शिवम् ॥ १२ ॥ ”

By taking from each of the first these *caranās* the 3rd, 17th, 6th and 14th letters respectively we get :—

“ श्रीसोमतिलकसूरिविरचितं ”

Sometimes an author introduces his name through a *śleṣa*. For instance Dhanapāla⁴ (Pr. Dhanavāla) has done so in the last verse of Rṣabha-pañcāśikā⁵ which runs as under :—

¹ This work is published in Gaekwad Oriental Series as No. XXXVII pp. 81-86. In the Govt. Mss. Library deposited at the Bhandarkar O. R. Institute, there are Mss. of this work and those for its commentary etc. All of them are described by me in “ the Descriptive Catalogue of Jaina Mss.” Vol. XVIII about to be sent to the press.

² This is here reproduced from my D. C. J. M.

³ As regards other peculiarities of this verse, the reader is referred to my Sanskrit *bhūmikā* (p. 26) of Stuticaturvīṣatikā of Śobhana Muni.

⁴ He is a brother of Śobhana Muni whose Stuticaturvīṣatikā was commented upon by him. This is published by the Āgamodaya Samiti as No. 52.

⁵ This work is edited by me with various commentaries etc., and is published in D. L. J. P. F. Series as No. 83 together with two other works of Dhanapāla.

“इय उताणग्गिपलावियकम्मिधणबालबुद्धिणा वि मए ।
भत्तीहस्सुओ भवभयसमुद्दबोहिस्थबोहिकलो ॥ ५० ॥”

Samayasundara Upādhyāya has mentioned his name in Kalpalatā¹ at the end of each of the 9 vyākhyānas. He has adopted the well-known method of splitting up the name into two parts and of suggesting their positions. This will be clear from the following verse :—

“व्याख्यानं कल्पसूत्रस्य प्रथमं सुगमं स्फुटम् ।
शिष्यार्थं पाठकाश्चक्रुः समयादिमसुन्दराः ॥”

Now a word about a Jaina writer mentioning the name of his *guru*, when he perhaps wants to remain incognito.

The avacūrnikāra of Jinaprabha Sūri's Jināgamastava has introduced the name² of his *guru* as could be seen from taking the 4th and the 5th letters from each of the 4 *caranās* of the following verse :—

“ध्यायन्ति श्रीविशेषाय गता वैशालयेन यम् ।
स्तुतिद्वाराजयश्रीदः श्रीवीरगुरुगोरवः ॥”

Avacūrnikāra has himself said in the last verse that his *guru*'s name is mentioned in a concealed form in the first verse. This last verse is as under :—

“आदिगुप्ताभिधानस्य गुरोः पादप्रसादतः ।
पदविच्छेदरूपेयं विवृत्तिर्लिखिता मया ॥”

Vivekavilāsa is another work that may be referred to in this connection ; for, from the first letter of each of the 4 *caranās* of the following verse we learn the name Jivadeva.

“जीववत् प्रतिमा यस्य वचो मधुरिमाञ्चितम् ।
देहं गेहं श्रियस्त्वं स्वं वन्दे सूरिवरं गुरुम् ॥”³

¹ This is a Sanskrit commentary on Kalpasūtra attributed to Bhadrabāhusvāmin. For a description of its Mss. see my D. C. J. M. Vol. XVII, pt. II; Nos. 520-522.

² विशालगजगुरु.

³ For this verse and the information connected with it, I am indebted to Munirāja Paṇyavijayaājī.

REVIEWS

PRAVACANASĀRA : [The *Pravacanasāra* of Kundakunda Ācārya together with the commentary *Tattvadīpikā* by Amṛtacandra Sūri, with English Translation by BAREND FADDEGON, Edited with an Introduction by F. W. THOMAS, Cambridge. 1935, pp. xxiv+228, Jaina Literature Society Series Vol. I, Price 15s. net].

Kundakunda is unquestionably an authority on Jaina dogmatics; and his *Pravacanasāra*, despite its sectarian touches, especially certain leanings towards the so called Digambara persuasion, is a quintessential composition dealing with epistemological, ontological and monastic aspects of Jainism. On this Text there are Sanskrit commentaries of Amṛtacandra, Jayasena, Prabhācandra and Malliṣeṇa; and besides there are Kannaḍa and Hindi commentaries by Bālacandra and Hemarāja respectively (For a detailed information about them see my Introduction pp. 97 etc. to *Pravacanasāra* which is in the press being published by the Rāyachandra Jaina Śāstramālā, Bombay).^{*} Of all the works of Kundakunda this work has attracted more attention of orientalists since its contents were summarised by R. G. Bhandarkar in his Report for 1884. The present publication is an English translation of 'the Prakrit stanzas of Kundakunda together with the commentary of Amṛtacandra.'

The Editor has added an Introduction of about 14 pp. discussing some important topics about Kundakunda and his works. The editor, after surveying the views of Pt. Gajādharalāl (who closely follows Pt. Premi *Jaina Hitaishī* Vol. X.) that Kundakunda belonged to c. 250 A. D., and those of K. B. Pathak that he belonged to the 6th century, comes to a possible conclusion that Kundakunda flourished in the 3rd or the 4th century of the Christian era especially in the light of the Jaina tradition, the general

^{*} Since published.

tone of his works, the manner of his references to scriptures and the possibility that he was earlier than Umāsvāti.

The question of the date of Kundakunda is a most perplexing one. It is true that the Paṭṭāvalis are not reliable and the inscriptions not contemporary evidences; but if they agree on fundamental points and if there is no conflict from other sources, their information does deserve a judicious consideration in the light of other circumstantial evidence. The editor has not detected another weak point in Prof. Pathak's uneven arguments, namely, the meaning of the word *anvaya* as taken by Pathak. It is accepted that the *anvaya* of Kundakunda existed as early as 6th or 7th century A. D.; but from this it does not follow that Kundakunda lived about 528 A. D., because, for instance, Padmanandi of the 15th century A. D. calls himself a *Kundakundānvaya-dhurīṇa*. Pathak's evidences cannot supply any earlier limit. Pathak's attempt to identify Śivakumāra with a contemporary king was only a probability, because it is Jayasena, who comes about one thousand years later, that tells us that Kundakunda wrote for one Śivakumāra Mahārāja. The argument cannot 'disappear,' but it has to be understood with certain reservations. To quote a parallel case, there are scholars who would take Kālidāsa and Dignāga as contemporaries on the authority of a dubious statement of Mallinātha. Further the editor remarks, 'what is more decisive is that it (i. e. Śivakumāra) is known as the name of the hero of an old Jaina story which is alluded to by Kundakunda himself (*Bhāva-prābhṛta* v. 51): this must be the ultimate basis of the late commentator's association of Kundakunda with a king of that name'. It cannot be *decisive* but only plausible, because Kundakunda refers not only to Śivakumāra but to many other persons: Bāhubali (*Bhāva-pāhuḍa* v. 44), Madhupiṅga (v. 45), Vaśiṣṭha (v. 46), Bāhu (v. 49), Dipāyana (v. 50), Bhavyasena (v. 52), Śivabhūti (v. 53), Surattaputta (*Silapāhuḍa* v. 30) etc.; and there is no reason why Jayasena should specially select the name of Śivakumāra alone and take him to be a contemporary of Kundakunda. About the priority of Kundakunda over Umāsvāti there is not much doubt, and it can be shown that many sūtras of Umāsvāti closely follow certain gāthās from Kundakunda's works. A close comparison of the Śvetāmbara

canon with the works of Kundakunda shows that they inherit much that is common, and, as I have said elsewhere, the works of Kundakunda are of a compilatory character, put together by way of memory notes at a time when Digambaras refused to accept the canon as shaped by the Pāṭaliputra council. That also explains why some of his works are called *Sāras* and *Pāhudas*. The editor rightly says that the references to non-Jaina schools do not help us to settle the date definitely. One is perfectly aware that the Prakrit dialect would yield 'no chronological certainties,' but this should not be an excuse, as it has been in the case of our editor, to neglect that aspect altogether. Savants like Pischel and Jacobi have often used the dialectal evidence in matters of relative chronology; and a moderate attempt, so far as *Pravacanasāra* is concerned, has been already made by me in this direction (See *Journal of the University of Bombay*, Vol. II, part VI). Towards the problem of Kundakunda's date I might further add that the Merkara copper plates of 466 A. D. (looked upon as apocryphal by some) mention Kundakundānvaya, and *Sarvārthasiddhi* (II, 10) of Pūjyapāda quotes some gāthās in the same order as found in *Bārasa Anuvakkhā* of Kundakunda. A close study of their works shows that the relative chronology should be like this: Kundakunda, Umāsvāti, Samantabhadra, Siddhasena and Pūjyapāda (c. 5th century A. D.). So it is more probable that Kundakunda flourished at the beginning of the Christian era, as I have shown in my Introduction. The editor has not taken into consideration Prof. Chakravarti's discussion about Kundakunda's date, though he mentions his edition of *Pañcāstikāya*.

The editor's discussion about Kundakunda's work is very poor. He gives merely the editions, and we do not get any information about the form and contents of various works of Kundakunda. The facts that some Mss. of *Mūlācāra* attribute its authorship to Kundakunda and that Prabhācandra attributes Prakrit Bhaktis to Kundakunda are not at all noticed by the editor. It appears that even some of the good editions of Kundakunda's works have not reached the hands of the editor; for instance, *Ṣaṭ-Prābhṛtādi-saṃgraha*, Ed. Māṇikachandra Jaina Granthamālā, Vol. 17, which contains the Sanskrit commentary of Śrutasāgara etc. and the edition of *Samayasāra* published by Rāya chandra Jaina Śāstramālā, Bombay, 1919.

The editor remarks that stanzas 24-34 of Chap. II (III ?) seem out of place and have the air of an interpolation. It is a hasty pronouncement. I have studied the whole problem, and have come to the conclusion that these gāthās are not inconsistent with the utterances of Kundakunda in his other works ; some of the gāthās so left by Amṛtacandra are very old ones, and some of them are already known to him (See the discussion in my introduction to *Pravacanasāra* pp. 50-54). Still the question remains why Amṛtacandra has not included them in his recension.

In one place the editor says : ' in the works attributed to Kundakunda there are no allusions to particular scriptures.' I may point out here that Kundakunda definitely refers to a *Pratikramaṇa-sūtra* in his *Niyamasāra*, gāthā 94 (*Paḍikāmaṇa-nāmadheye sutte jaha vaṇṇidaṃ paḍikamaṇaṃ*).

There are certain errors of facts in the Introduction of the editor, and they require correction. There is no such work as *Prābhṛtasāra* (p. xv) on which Bālacandra is said to have written a commentary : in fact he has commented on all the three works (*Pañcāstikāya*, *Pravacanasāra* and *Samayasāra*) of Kundakunda ; it was an error first committed by K. B. Pathak, and that appears to be followed here. Vardhanadeva (p. xv) is not known from any references : the correct name is Śrīvardhadeva who is often identified with one Tumbūlūrācārya and not Tumbūlācārya. *Sīlapāhuḍa* refers to Surattaputta and not to Rudra Sātyakiputra (p. xvi) ; the editor should have looked to the Prakrit gāthā and not easily be misled by the Sanskrit rendering *Aṣṭaprabhṛta* is not at all the name of a work with ' eight topics ' (p. xix), but it is an editorial designation given to eight small treatises, each quite independent of the other, attributed to Kundakunda ; it is an error similar to *Chappāhuḍa* which is a designation for six pāhuḍas (excepting *Liṅga* and *Sīla-pāhuḍa*). *Niyama* in the title of *Niyamasāra* does not mean the ' rule of life,' but the text is so called because it discusses about three jewels which necessarily (*niyamaṇa*) lead the soul to liberation. There is no edition of *Niyamasāra* by Gajādharalāl ; perhaps the editor means *Samayaprabhṛtam*. *Samayasāra-kalaśa-nāṭaka* is not at all an independent work of Amṛtacandra, but it is only a name given to a

compilation of all the verses from his commentary on *Samayasāra*. The name of Amṛtacandra's commentary on *Samayasāra* is not *Tātparyavṛtti* but *Ātmakhyāti*.

The Prakrit gāthās are often cryptic. The style of Amṛtacandra's commentary is artificial, elaborate and heavy. It is a pleasure to read and enjoy the sound and sense of Amṛtacandra's utterances, but to translate the same with justice is a hard task. So turning to the translation one finds that the gāthās have been interpreted mainly according to Amṛtacandra's commentary. Differences in translation are possible in many places, and even mistakes can be pointed out here and there. A few typical errors might be noted: in gāthā I, 13 *visayātīdaṃ* = 'surpassing objects' is not correct; *visaya* undoubtedly refers to *indriya-viśaya*. In gāthā I, 74 *jīvāṇaṃ devadaṃtāṇaṃ* = 'including those of gods'; the translation may be accepted, but the force of *aṃtāṇaṃ* is missed; the gāthā has in view the enumeration of four kinds of mundane beings in which the gods come last. The rendering of *pōggalajivappagassa* (II, 37) as 'which has souls and matter for self' is a good illustration how the translator is guided by the Dictionary even at the cost of the sense. The gāthās especially could have been translated more literally in many places: for instance *dhoda-ghādi-kamma-malaṃ* = 'free from the stain of destructive Karmas'; the exact significance of *dhoda* is missed. The long sentence *parama-Bhaṭṭāraka* etc. is rendered as 'prostrate myself before the holy Vardhamāna the mention of whose name is auspicious and is worthy of being praised by the most excellent Masters (*bhaṭṭārakas*), Great Gods, Tutelary deities and Supreme Lords (*parmeśvaras*)' (p. 3). Any one acquainted with the usual epithets of a Tirthamkara added by commentators will immediately see that *Paramabhaṭṭāraka* etc. are the adjectives of Vardhamāna; and this way of rendering upsets the various notions of Jaina pantheon. There are many such errors here and there. When Amṛtacandra writes in an involved style the translation also becomes tiresome. When Amṛtacandra's sentences are short, the translation is lucid and refreshing (I, 44). Some of the footnotes are important and informative. These differences and errors detected should not mean in any way the disparagement of performance. The translator has taken great

pains, and he has accomplished his task with an amount of success. The translator is not merely a cold academician, as can be seen from one of his remarks ; ' During these last years I have realised the joy of a deeper and better understanding of the Jaina religion. '

The translator should have outlined to us in the Introduction a general survey of the philosophical tenets of Jainism as given in *Pravacanasāra* in comparison with other leading systems of Indian philosophy, because every student cannot be expected to wade through the currents and cross-currents of a commentator's elaboration. The present publication is a good addition to our knowledge of Jainism ; and it is hoped that the Boden Professor of Sanskrit would soon issue the various volumes of the ' projected series ' of the Jaina Literature Society that the Jaina studies might go ahead to keep pace with Vedic and Buddhistic studies.

A. N. Upadhye

INDO-ARYAN LITERATURE AND CULTURE =
ORIGINS = BY PROF. NAGENDRANATH GHOSE, M. A.,
B. L., of the Dacca University. (The Book Company
Ltd., Calcutta, 1934.)

This work, meant, according to the learned author, for "the remaking of a lost world," gives, to what are hitherto considered as "absurdities and insoluble puzzles," in the Indo-Aryan literature, "their own natural place and position in the newly oriented world."

Although bound in one volume, the book contains two separate works: the first runs over a large extent, and deals with the history of the Vrātyas of the East; while the second, which covers only the last (XIV) section, is devoted to culling the material out of the present Mahābhārata,—the material which alone, in the opinion of the learned author, formed the original "Draupadi-Sāgā," and was subsequently added to, and even altered, most mischievously by the wretched Brahman redactors.

It has been, hitherto, the fashion of the Western Scholars to take to task, off and on, the so called Brahman authors of old Indian literature, whenever these scholars found something unpalatable to their own taste or to their peculiar mode of reasoning. The learned author of the work under review, while disagreeing with the scholars of the 19th century, on some vital points, has, most faithfully followed the fashion of putting the whole blame upon the Brahman class, for giving a form to the Indian literature, which, in his opinion, ought to have existed in some other form, originally. In fact, this tendency has, in the present work of Prof. Ghose, reached such a pitch, that even an indifferent reader would think it highly ridiculous.

One who is given to reading a literature somewhat intensively, forms some ideas of his own; and once possessed by these ideas, he makes his own hypothesis, and works it out according to his own particular views, all the while, believing that he is doing something great. But the public, and especially the

keen-eyed critic, not being so biased, looks at the work from an impartial view-point, and it is thus that the real worth of any work is ultimately decided.

That the wholesale condemnation of the Brahmans, as a class, was so long done, and supported too, with some political motive, is now generally known, and the work seems to have recently been given up as a task achieved. Prof. Ghose, in harping upon the same tune, seems to serve kicks to a dead body !—not a very brave feat, indeed !

Leaving this main item, there remains very little indeed, that can be looked at as research work ! The thesis, laid down by the learned Professor, seems to have been constructed on the Vṛātya literature, and, “remains,” in the words of the author himself, “a matter of purely personal conjecture, unrelated altogether to the data of demonstrable historicity.”

Thus prepared, the reader may now look into the work itself : While the Aryan colonies were established in the Punjab, and the Western part of India, the East was populated by the Vṛātyas, who had their own religion, and were ruled by their own kings. Some Brahmans, being harassed by the oppression of Kṣatriya rulers, left the Aryan colonies, and emigrated to the Vṛātya country, in the East, where they Aryanised the whole population by certain Samskāras (ceremonials). This, in main, is the theory of the learned Professor, who has collected his material from the Atharva Veda, and some Brāhmaṇa works, as also from some of the Purāṇas. Prof. Ghose further holds that the Vedic literature was, as a whole, subsequently thoroughly revised by the priests who had managed to put down their oppressors by the help of the Vṛātya Kings, and thus, with mutual borrowing, made the whole of the population equally Aryanised, with a newly cast Vedic literature to suit the needs of the aryanised Vṛātyas ; and the collection of hymns regarding these latter, mainly covers the Atharva Veda.

Then the author, in the last section of his works, turns towards the Mahābhārata, the great Indian Epic, and with certain convictions already settled in his mind, offers, to the reader, the material of the Draupadī Saga, upon which the present huge

Brahmanical structure of the Epic, subsequently came to be built. The author,—the seer of this original saga!—cuts away the brahmanical portions so as to make out a form of the Saga. Thus, “the Satyavati Bhīṣma colloquy, and its uncomely issue,”—meaning the Niyoga episode,—is cut out as a Brahmanic elaboration. Pāṇḍu's Sons, too, are held to be his own work; Drona, his absurd son Aśvatthāman, and all about these, are held to be “a pure Brahmanic fabrication foisted on the original Saga.” Without giving a complete list of the these “vile” fabrications, it would be well to reproduce here what, according to the author, is “an absolutely sure test” for finding out these mischiefs from the present bulky form of our ancient Indian literature: “when any part of the narrative is found to be totally lacking in verisimilitude, and is, at the same time, seen to imply extravagant glorification of the Brahman, specially if this be at the expense of some other class, and even more so if it involves the humiliation of that class, then we may have the *rechauff* patented as sixteen-annas Brahman-made.” (p. 195).

S. N. Tadpatrikar

**FESTSCHRIFT MORIZ WINTERNITZ, herausgegeben
von Otto Stein und Wilhelm Gampert, 1933, Otto
Harrassowitz, Leipzig. Pp. XIV + 357.**

It is in the fitness of things that the life of a scholar should be crowned at a ripe old age with a volume of studies as a mark of respect from his fellow scholars, and we have been long accustomed to these Festschriften. But none deserves it more than this veteran scholar who for more than two decades has carried on the torch of the older generation of scholars. Winternitz's name is familiar to all students of Sanskrit Literature and is one to conjure with in many of its departments.

The work is divided into the following sections : Language, Literature, Religion, Philosophy, Culture and History, to wit, the various fields in which the learned Professor has shown keen interest. In the first section Debrunner (joint author of *Altindische Grammatik*, III) has an interesting note on the type *neṣa* and *parṣa* of the Vedic imperative in *-si*; Renou gives an exhaustive list of words in *-ima* in Sanskrit and studies the derivation of this interesting suffix. Among other interesting articles on Linguistics may be mentioned Alsdorf's observations on Pischel's *Materialien zur Kenntnis des Apabhramsa*.

The literature section is enriched by Weller on the Text-Criticism of the *Mahābhārata*, Schrader on the Recensions of the *Bhagavadgītā*, Meyer on the Cultivation of Trees in the *Agni-purāṇa*. The following names will vouch for the all-round authority and interest of this section : Richard Schmidt, Gode, Sarup and Koerner.

In the section on Religion we have Shamasastri on the Conception of Sin in the Vedas, Mrs. Rhys Davids on a Vanished Sakyan window, E. J. Thomas on Pre-Pāli terms in the *Pātimokkha*, Sieg and Siegling on the Fragments of a *Udāna*-commentary in Tokharian, Zachariae on Jain authors of the 16th and 17th Centuries, Aiyangar on *Pāñcarātra* in classical Tamil literature, and De on Pre-Caitanya Vaiṣṇavism in Bengal.

The section on Philosophy contains useful contributions on various aspects from Strauss, Edgerton, Hiriyanna, Sharma, Coomaraswamy, Frauwallner, Tucci, Schayer and Tavadia, all of which are as interesting as they are brief.

In the final chapter we meet with such well-known scholars like Charpentier, Geiger, Norman Brown, Przyluski, etc. Each contribution is the fruit of deep thought in the particular field, and to give a detailed criticism of the more important studies would require a volume in itself, which, indeed, is the highest praise for a Commemoration Volume.

Finally Prof. Winternitz is to be congratulated on having established such a wide circle of admirers, friends and pupils among all generations of scholars, and the Volume under review which is as fitting a tribute to his genius as to that of the different authors, deserves to be in the book shelf of every lover of India's Culture and Scholarship.

S. M. Katre

VOL. XVII]

[PART II

**Annals of the
Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute,
Volume XVII
1935-36**

EDITED BY


A. B. GAJENDRAGADKAR, M. A.,

Professor of Sanskrit, Elphinstone College, Bombay

AND

V. G. PARANJPE, M. A., LL. B., D. Litt.

Professor of Sanskrit, Fergusson College, Poona



Printed and published by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, M. A., Ph. D., at the
Bhandarkar Institute Press, Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute, Poona No. 4.

POONA

1936

CONTENTS

VOLUME XVII, PART II

(18-5-36)

ARTICLES	PAGES
1 Vedic Gods : I-IV, by Hiralal Amritlal Shah, B. A. ...	97-176
2 Kavidarpaṇam (A Prākṛta Treatise on Metres) by Prof. H. D. Velankar, M. A. ...	177-184
3 Epic Studies V. Notes on Mahābhārata Commentators by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, M. A., Ph. D. ...	185-202
4 Prof. P. P. S. Sastri, and the Date of Vādiraja- tīrtha by P. K. Gode, M. A. ...	203-210
REVIEWS	
5 The Gītā Rahasya or Science of Karmayoga by B. G. Tilak, (English Translation) Vol. I by B. S. Sukthankar, M. A., LL. B., reviewed by Prof. S. V. Danḍekar, M. A. ...	211-214
6 The Traditional Chronology of the Jainas (An outline of the Political Development of India from 543 B. C. to 78 A. D.) by Shantilal Shah reviewed by Prof. H. R. Kapadia, M. A. ...	215-216

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

Vol. XVII]

JANUARY 1936

[PART II

“VEDIC GODS: I-IV.”¹

BY

HIRALAL AMRITLAL SHAH, B. A., (Bombay, 2.).

SECTION—I: GODS “VARUṆA-MITRA-SŪRYA:

(1) *God Varuṇa*:— Fortunately for us, we possess a very distinctive description of the God Varuṇa in one of the hymns of R̥gveda. It says that he knows the course of ships on the sea. This is how the verse reads:—

“वेदो यो वीनां पदमन्तरिक्षेण पतताम् । वेदो नावः समुद्रियः ॥” RV I. 25.7.
(“Who knows the way of the birds that keep flying in the heaven (—‘Antarikṣa’); who knows the course of ships on the sea.”).

Herein, it seems, we get a clue as to the exact nature of this Vedic god. The course of navigation has ever been determined by the mariner’s compass which always shows the North, the needle pointing to the North Pole. It, therefore, suggests to me to take this particular description to refer to the *Pole Star* (a *Ursæ Minoris*—Polaris) the well known *Dhruva* star or to its regent god who knows the course of ships on sea. In RV. VII, 49, 3, we find that Varuṇa is associated with “waters” as their king. At this

¹ This paper was read before the 7th Oriental Conference, Baroda, in Dec. 1933; it has been enlarged and improved subsequently. Its summary will be found in the Proceedings of the Conference on pp. 125-130. For resume and references see paras 86, 87. For Table of contents etc., see pp. 149-172.

stage, we will not discuss the nature of "Āpah (अपः)" in the RV. It is evident that Varuṇa is connected with "sea" in one way or the other.¹

(2) Varuṇa knows the ways of the birds that soar in Antarikṣa. The "bird" here does not seem to be an ordinary bird which flies. It seems to refer to stars which have their course in the sky. We find that the Sun is called a bird:—

"In various passages Sūrya is conceived as a bird traversing space. He is a bird (X, 177, 1-2) or a ruddy bird (V, 47, 3). is represented as flying (I, 191, 9), is compared with a flying eagle (VII, 63, 5) and seems to be directly called an eagle (V, 45, 9)....." (Mac. p. 31).

If flying 'birds' are in reality the stars, then the reference to the knowledge of Varuṇa in their connection seems to be the Polar Longitudes and the Polar Latitudes which pass on, from Dhruva to all the stars and all the places. It is in this sense that (we think) the description of the god Varuṇa—the regent god of Dhruva as universal monarch, with spies and with a knowledge of all people, is appropriate. He is the only steady one in the changing and revolving universe. That way we prefer to interpret the verses in RV. I, 25, 10-13.

(3) It is significant that Varuṇa is associated with night. This fact would go to support his stellar nature and his visibility at night. We read that—

"In another passage (VIII, 41, 3) it is said that Varuṇa has embraced (pari śasvaje) the nights, and by his occult power has established the mornings or days (usrah).....In the later Vedic period of the Brāhmaṇas, Varuṇa comes to be specially connected with the nocturnal heaven. Thus Mitra is said to have produced the day and Varuṇa the night (TS. VI, 4, 8, 3.); and the day is said to belong to Mitra and the night to Varuṇa (TS II, 1, 7, 4.)." (Mac. p 25).

(4) God Mitra:— Dhruva star is further associated (on earth) with the Gnomon (Śaṅku) which is inclined to its altitude: it fixes up the northern direction (one of the four cardinal points)

¹ Cf. para 65 "Sindhu" and note to Para 58 with reference to "Fish" and "sea" in connections with Canopus and Vasiṣṭha).

just as, on sea, for the same purpose, it is helpful to the navigator through his compass. For an idea of the Śaṅku of this type¹ we may well think of the one that is to be seen in the Indian astronomical observatories of Jai Simha at Ujjain, Jaipur, Delhi and Benares and which is therein known as the "Samrāt-Yantra." (Kaye p. 35ff., p. 41ff.) This type of Śaṅku is of prime importance for the measurement of time, with the help of the shadow the sun casts on it and on its equatorial side quadrants facing East and West (the two other cardinal points).² It will be seen that the description of Varuṇa is "वेद मास धृतव्रतो द्वादश प्रजावतः वेदा य उपजायते ॥"

("The righteous knows the twelve months with the family; he knows the offshoot that arises therefrom." (RV. I, 25, 8).)

This description of Varuṇa brings us to the consideration of measurement of time which is done through Śaṅku.

(5) The associate god of Varuṇa is Mitra God in Vedas and therefore, we may as well take this Mitra God to be a personification or the regent god of Śaṅku, the Indian Gnomon (associated with Dhruva) and then reread the passage (quoted above) which says that the day belongs to Mitra. It is this character of Mitra, that his description of impelling men to action and helping them (or the agriculturists) acquires its proper sense:—

“मित्रो जनान्यातयति ब्रुवाणो मित्रो दाधार पृथिवीमुत याम् ।
मित्रः कृष्टीरनिमिषाभि चष्टे मित्राय हव्यं घृतवज्जुहोत ॥”

¹ We read in the "Pañcasiddhāntikā" Ch. XIII about the Gnomon as under:—

"The observer placing his eye at the base of the straight gnomon, is to incline it in such a way, that the top of the gnomon is in the straight line joining the eye and the Pole Star" (31).

"At Laṅkā this observation is performed with a gnomon lying flat on the surface, on Sumeru with one standing upright, and in the intermediate regions with one inclined more or less" (32).

"The people at Laṅkā see the Pole star in the horizon; those on the Meru in the Zenith; those dwelling between, see it between (the Horizon and the Zenith)" (26).

[From G. Thibaut's translation (1889) reprinted by the Punjab Sanskrit Book Depot, Lahore, 1930 (p. 86).]

It should not be forgotten that the northern point of this Śaṅku is in the Pole Star in Dhruva Star and not in the Polar Point.

² Thus the 'Friendly' function of the Mitra God arises co-ordinating the function of the two gods Varuṇa and Sun.

" It is the voice of Mitra that impels men :

Mitra sustains earth as also heaven ; with a steady gaze, Mitra watches the active folk (or agriculturists). Pour to Mitra the luscious oblation. " (RV. III, 59, 1).

(6) The function of Mitra and Varuṇa can now be followed when it is said about it as under:—

" In the AV. (IX, 3, 18) Mitra is asked to uncover in the " morning what has been covered up by Varuṇa. " " In the AV. (XIII, 3, 13) Mitra at sunrise is contrasted with Varuṇa in the evening " (Mac. P. 29).

The antithesis between Mitra and Varuṇa is expressed as under:—

" S. B. (XII, 9, 2, 12) asserts that this world is Mitra, that (the celestial) world is Varuṇa. " (Mac P. 25).

In company with Varuṇa:—

" By occult power Varuṇa, standing in the air, measures out the earth with the sun as with a measure (V, 85, 5,) Varuṇa and Mitra send the dawns (III, 61, 7), make the sun to cross the sky and obscure it with cloud and rain, while the honeyed drops fall (V, 63, 4); or (V, 63, 3 and 7) they cause heaven to rain and they uphold the ordinances by the occult power of the Asura (here-Dyaus or Parjanya), " (Mac. P. 24).

(7) Perhaps the golden shield (RV. I, 25, 13) or the covering which Varuṇa is said to be putting on before sending out spies (spaśas) relate to his using the sun as a measure during day-time. We will consider the " Dawns " -Uśas-later on.

MITRA-VARUNA :— and SUN

(8) Both these gods Mitra and Varuṇa constitute an entity as described above. Their eye is Sūrya, the sun (Mac. p. 30:— " The eye of Sūrya is mentioned several times (V. 40, 8 etc.) but he is himself equally often called the eye of Mitra and Varuṇa (cf. Mac. p. 23) or of Agni as well (I, 115, 1,). "

It is natural that Mitra (Śaṅku) is closely associated with the sun at day-time ; accordingly it has led Vedic scholars to take him for a Sun-God or a god of light specially connected with the Sun:—

" The somewhat scanty evidence of the Veda showing that Mitra is a solar deity, is corroborated by the Avesta and Persian

religion in general. Here Mithra is undoubtedly a Sun-god or a god of light specially connected with the Sun." (Mac. p. 30).

(9) We may point out that the beneficent nature of Mitra of the Veda (and Mithra of the Avesta) consists in the essential need he fulfils by supplying the measurements of time, *for proper action and for performance of rites or rituals*. The ethical side of this god arises in that way. The measurement follows upon the linking of the North (with Varuṇa) and the East (with Sūrya) with the help of this god.

(10) It will now be interesting to note what is said about Varuṇa:—

"The hypothesis recently advanced by Oldenberg that Varuṇa primarily represented the moon. cannot be passed over here..... he believes that Varuṇa and Mitra were the moon and the sun..... This hypothesis does not seem to account at all well for the actual characteristics of Varuṇa in the R̥gveda.....It has already been mentioned that Varuṇa goes back to the Indo-Iranian period, for the Ahura Mazda of the Avesta agrees with him in character though not in name. The name of Varuṇa may even be Indo-European. At least, the long accepted identification of the word with the Greek "ouranos", though presenting phonetic difficulties, has not been rejected by some recent authorities on comparative philology " (Mac. p. 28). (cf. para 69.)

DEVAS-STARS

(11) The difficulties that the scholars experienced in a proper understanding of the Vedic gods such as Varuṇa, Mitra etc. is quite natural. The impressions which work with them are that the Vedic seers merely sang the glories of a variety of natural phenomena. Hence the scholars naturally restrict their attention to some obvious happenings such as storm, wind, lightning, dawn, fire, rains ; or to the course of sun and moon or at times to some tribal history. But the mention of them as *shining ones*, lustrous as conveyed by the sense of "div"—*to shine—in the word "Deva" used for gods*, would naturally invite our attention to the starry realm for a solution of the enigma. The foremost in such an astronomical realm is, as we suggest, Dhruva in the Varuṇa ; and the second identity is of Mitra with the Śaṅku connected with Dhruva, as Mitra is connected with Varuṇa. Both are connected with the sun and moon as every other star

is connected with them. The connection of *Mitra with Time* (through *Dhruva* and *Sun*) necessarily leads us to a consideration of the *Vedic calendar with its solstice and equinoctial points* and without which, we will never be able to comprehend the nature of other Vedic creations, much less their grouping together on several occasions in several hymns. We have already covered some ground in our explanations of the grouping together of *Mitra* and *Varuna*.

(12) Before proceeding with the determination of the Vedic calendar, it will not be out of place to note that what applies to the Vedic texts does apply to the texts of other non-Indian religions where strong resemblances either to the Vedic conceptions, to Vedic narrations or to Vedic terminology are a marked characteristic. A better understanding of *Varuna* and *Mitra* will therefore naturally elucidate the basic conception of the greatest (Iranian) god *Ahura Mazda* and of god *Mithra*. Similarly, Vedic *Vṛtra*, *Soma*, *Yama*, *Vivasvat*, will naturally help us all to know the Iranian *Verethraghna*, *Haoma*, *Yima* and *Vivahvant* better than before. Vedic *Mātariśvan* will help us to see through the legend of *Prometheus*. Even this episode requires a clearer conception of the Vedic (stellar) calendar that the Vedic seers seem to have fixed up.

SECTION—II: OLD CALENDAR

(13) Vedic Calendar :— In order to understand other Vedic gods, it will be necessary for us to understand the nature of the Vedic months, Vedic Year, the Solstices and the Equinoctial points thereof and the system and division of constellations. We have practically no direct evidence which may be considered to be of the nature of a positive proof. We are left to gather and infer from many sources which differ widely and which do not reconcile with one another easily in their variances; and in the absence of one good reliable data, the choice of any particular one, or a suitable explanation of any growth that cannot be explained is difficult and the task becomes somewhat perilous. It can be easily seen that many hands must work at it and the limitations of a single individual applies very well to the humble but a bold attempt of the present writer. It has been found that many authors

must be kept out for our purposes of investigation; and so too, the many prevalent theories (ancient or modern) have to be laid aside in this matter. And above all, it has not been possible for the writer to go through several previous attempts that the learned (ancient and modern) scholars have made in this direction, because of the immensity of the controversial nature of the subject, and of the limited ability of the writer.

(14) As we quoted before, Varuṇa knows twelve months and the co-related matters with the offshoots. It does point to the adoption of a year of 12 luni-solar months and its adjustment to the solar year. It cannot be forgotten that in India, the very names of the months and their connection with the lunar mansions, bring to us the consideration of the system of Indian constellations which also has to be determined for the application to the Vedic conceptions. And herein we possess a great advantage in the present investigations because all the zodiacal constellations and many prominent stars and star-groups have *their regent gods known to us*. Since we find Varuṇa to be one of the starry realm, we can extend our scope in that direction to see if we get results which are better than what have been obtained hitherto without reference to stars or to the true old calendar.

(15) We refer to the works of Kālidāsa and of Kautilya for our purpose since they bear the impress of *profound scholarship and of their inclination to the Vedic lore* and because they are *least modified or tampered with* and therefore they can be relied upon as a safe guide.

(16) Pūrṇimānta months :-- In "Meghadūta," of Kālidāsa we read that the hero got the first glimpse of the approaching rainy season, on the last day of the Āṣāḍha month, that then the following Śrāvaṇa month was quite near to it and that since the day he saw the clouds, he had to spend four more months in exile, its termination being the 11th day in the bright fortnight of the month Kārttika, when Lord Viṣṇu wakes from his sleep. There is one variant reading in this text which would mean that it was the 'first' day of Āṣāḍha rather than the last one when the clouds were visible. It has taxed the ingenuity of the commentators to square the latter variant reading with all that is related above in this connection. They ultimately leave the

text to itself stating that it is not to be literally interpreted. They are in such a fix because they understand the months to be of the Amānta type, starting with the moment of New moon. However, such is not the case. The months herein are Pūrṇimānta type, ending with the bright fortnight

The portions of the text here referred to are as under:—

“आषाढस्य प्रशमदिवसे मेघमाश्लिष्टसानुम् ।” (v. l. ‘प्रथमदिवसे’)
MeghaDūta-2.

“प्रत्यासन्ने नभसि दयिताजीवितालम्बनार्थी ।” , , -4.

“शापान्तो मे भुजगशयनादुत्थिते शार्ङ्गपाणो
मासानन्यान् गमय चतुरो लोचने मीलयित्वा ॥”

(v. l. ‘शेषान्मासान्’) , , -115.

[“... (saw) on the last day of Āṣāḍha a cloud, resting on the top of the hill (2).” “ Desirous of sustaining the life of his beloved wife, the month of Śrāvaṇa being at hand (4); My curse will terminate when Lord Viṣṇu rises from his sleep resting till then on the serpent; pass the remaining four months with the eyes shut..... ” (115)]

Since 30 Tithis (a tithi is one digit of moon in the luni-solar month of 30 tithis) would constitute $29\frac{1}{2}$ solar days, four months (of 120 digits-luni solar tithis) would require $29\frac{1}{2} \times 4 = 118$ solar days (according to the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya). Since $30\frac{1}{2}$ solar days constitute a solar month $30\frac{1}{2} \times 4 = 122$ solar days would make up four solar months; and since it is only 11th day (in the bright fortnight) when the curse is to terminate, four days of the fortnight (at the end the fourth month) are deducted from 122, which brings the total of day (of four months) to 118th day from the time the clouds first appeared. It will be seen that the months do end with bright half if the portions of the text stand co-related as they do. Śrāvaṇa would be near to Āṣāḍha only if it is ending in its full moon.

(17) Let us take up the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, to determine the nature of the calendar in vogue in his days (B. C. 4th cent).

“त्रिशतं चतुःपञ्चाशच्चाहोरात्राणां कर्मसंवत्सरः । तमाषाढीपर्यवसानमूर्ध्नि पूर्णं वा दयात् । करणाधिष्ठितमधिमासकं कुर्यात् ।” (Ch. II, 7, 25).

[cf. ‘Jain Text’ — ‘C’ on p. 154 and note thereon].

“The Civil Year will constitute 354 solar days. He should

pay him in that year more or less when it is completed on the full moon of the month Āṣāḍha, ('आषाढी'). He must provide for the extra month determined as per its procedure (Karaṇa)."

We learn from Kauṭilya that the month Āṣāḍha (which, we saw, ended at full moon) constitutes the last month in the hot season, while the rainy season with Śrāvaṇa ushers the southern course of sun. The mid-day (at Ujjain as per Indain convention) in the month of Āṣāḍha is the day when the shadow (cast on Śaṅku by the sun on its reaching the summer solstice point) disappears. The equinoctial days-a day of 15 muhūrtas and the night of 15 muhūrtas-occur in the months of Caitra and Āśvayuja (solar month).

The text of the above referred to passages is as under:--

“श्रावणः षोष्ठपदश्च वर्षा । आश्वयुजः कार्तिकश्च शरत् । मार्गशीर्षः पौषश्च
हेमन्तः ।

“माघः फाल्गुनश्च शिशिरः । चैत्रो वैशाखश्च वसन्तः । ज्येष्ठा मूलौ च आषाढश्च
ग्रीष्मः ।

“शिशिरायुत्तरायणम् । वर्षादि दक्षिणायनम् । द्व्ययनस्संवत्सरः ।”

“आषाढे मासि नष्टञ्छायो मध्याह्नौ भवति ।”

“पञ्चदशमुहूर्तो दिवसो रात्रिश्च चैत्रे मास्याश्वयुजे च मासि भवतः ।”

(Ch. II, 20, 38.)

[Cf. 'Jaina Texts—' C. E. L. on pp. 154-161 and
notes thereon]

(18) Solstice points:-- There is thus no doubt that the system in vogue then points to the solstice points on the first day of the solar month Śrāvaṇa, when it is the dark half because the civil year ends with full moon of the month Āṣāḍha (the difference between the two being adjusted by two extra luni-solar months in one cycle (yuga) of five solar years as shown in the concluding two verses of this chapter:--

“शिशिरायुत्तरायणम् । वर्षादि दक्षिणायनम् ।

द्व्ययनस्संवत्सरः । पञ्चसंवत्सरो युगमिति ।

दिवसस्य हरत्यर्कषष्टिभागमृती ततः ।

करोत्येकमहश्छेदं तथैवेकं च चन्द्रमाः ॥

एवमर्धतृतीयानामब्दानामधिमासकम् ।

ग्रीष्मे जनयतः पूर्वं पञ्चाब्दान्ते च पश्चिमम् ॥”

[H. ‘पूर्वं’ ? or ‘नूनं’ ?]

(Ch. II, 20, 38).

(Cf. ‘Jaina Texts’ -- H. I. pp. 157-158).

“ Seasons from Śisīra and onwards constitute the Winter solstice and those from Varṣā and onwards constitute the Summer solstice. Two solstices make up one year - five years making up a cycle (Yuga). The sun carries off (is in excess by) $1/60$ th day of a (civil) day and thus 60 parts ($1/60 \times 60 = 1$ day) make a complete day in a season of two months. Likewise the moon is short by $1/60$ th day in a day (civil) and is thus short by one complete day in a season of two months. In this way, when $2\frac{1}{2}$ years are completed (60 luni-solar months are completed) there is an extra luni-solar month. In the end, when five years are over another (extra month) is added, at the end, in Grīṣma season. ”

Since the luni-solar year ends in the full-moon of Āṣāḍha (‘आषाढीपर्यवसानं’) there can never be Grīṣma season at the end of $2\frac{1}{2}$ years. Hence the last line of the verse in the text is either faulty or of a clumsy construction. It must either read “ nūnam ” = definitely instead of “ Pūrvam ”; or if “ Pūrvam ” reading holds good, it must be construed with the previous line of the verse, while the word “ Grīṣme ” should be taken with the word “ Pañcābdānte ”.

(19) It appears then that the two solstice points, and therefore the two equinoctial points too are fixed in the solar year although, the digits of the moon at those particular four moments (of 2 solstices and of 2 equinoctials) naturally vary in a cycle of five solar years. But the point of interest lies in the fact we glean as to the exact place of the sun amongst stars at those four moments. That was just the reason (and not its day to day application) that we traced the nature of old calendar from the authentic source that is still available. It will be noticed that even these texts that we consulted are not left intact as we have noticed in the discussions (1) over a variant in the Meghadūta and (2) over the season of the first extra luni-solar

month at the end of $2\frac{1}{2}$ years in the Arthasāstra. A further notice of this calendar is material to our investigations.

(20) The year: Luni-Solar :-- As 354 solar days comprised one civil year (Arthasāstra-Ch. II, 7, 25) ending with the full moon or luni-solar month Āṣāḍha, the counting of fortnights and months had to be adjusted, because 15 days made a fortnight and 30 days a (civil) month of two fortnights (ibid-Ch. II, 27, 38 " पञ्चदशाहोरात्राः पक्षः । सोमाप्यायनश्शुक्लः । सोमावच्छेदनो बहलः । द्विपक्षो मासः । त्रिंशद्दहोरात्रः प्रकर्ममासः । " [" 15 days and nights make one fortnight which is bright when the moon waxes and which is dark when the moon wanes. Two fortnights make a Civil month "] and since twelve such months would make 360 such days, adjustment in civil counting (360 days) to the luni-solar phenomena amounting to 354 days was brought about by non-counting of one day every third and seventh fortnight in the season of four (Cf. को. IX, 1, 135-36 कालः शीतोष्णवर्षात्मा etc.) months from Varṣā. Thus 6 days are not-counted days and the total stops at 354 days. Since the year begins in the dark half of Śrāvaṇa (आषाढीपर्यवसानं) one day of each of the dark fortnight of the months Bhādra, Kārttika, Pausa, Phālguna, Vaiśākha, and Āṣāḍha will not be counted. To this effect is the text of the Arthasāstra :--

“राजवर्षे मासः पक्षो दिवसश्च व्युष्ट वर्षहिमन्तग्रीष्माणौ तृतीयसप्तमा

दिवसोनाः पक्षादशेषाः पूर्णाः पृथगधिमासक इति कालः । (Ch. II, 6, 24).

(“ The royal year, the month, the fortnight, the day the new year’s day on Śrāvaṇa (first day of the dark half of Śrāvaṇa), the 3rd and 7th fortnight of three. (six compressed into three) seasons—rainy, winter and summer season short by a day (3rd of 14 days ; then 7th of 14 days—of each of the three seasons), the rest of the fortnights (of these three seasons)—intercalary month being separate—these are the divisions of time. ” ¹

[Cf. Jain Text “ M ” on p. 161].

¹ We come across the usage of seasons with counting by fortnights in each, in several inscriptions of the second century A. D., at Nasik and Karle. E. I. Vol. VII pp. 61 to 71, Vol. VIII, pp. 59-94.

(21) Malamāsa :— The system of calendar thus fixed up in the Arthasāstra is a cycle of five solar years made up of 1830 (5×366) solar days ; to the solar years are adjusted the luni-solar year (of 354 days—12 months $\times 29\frac{1}{2}$ days) by two extra luni-solar months within that cycle. Still, the adjustment is not complete because it comes to only 1829 days (62 months $\times 29\frac{1}{2}$ days = 1829 days). This discrepancy of a day within five years would necessarily obtrude upon the reality in course of several years as well as any such that may be in the length of the year of 366 days instead of a year of 365 days and odd. (The civil adjustment to the luni-solar year i. e. 36) days minus 6 non-calculated days to equate with 354 days in the year just shown before is not in question here). Hence, it looks, that the final adjustment of calculations to the recurrence of natural phenomena such as the exact time of completion of luni-solar year and of the return of the sun to the fixed points of solstice or equinoctials has been devised in the provision of “ Mala Māsa,” an *expurgated* month (of perhaps varying number of days) at some future period, the period being determined by the school according to its own adoption of a data of the length of a luni-solar month (Kautilya has $29\frac{1}{2}$ days). The Jain system, the same as of Kautilya in most of the points, differs here, in as much as, the luni-solar month consists of $29\frac{3}{8}$ days, 62 months making in all 1830 days, thus fully equating them with the cycle). We would interpret the text in the Arthasāstra Ch. II, 20, 38, as under :—

Text — “ द्वात्रिंशद् मलमासः । पञ्चात्रिंशदश्ववाहायाः । चत्वारिंशद्वस्तिवाहायाः । ”

Translation :— “ Thirty second (solar year perhaps) has a suppressed (solar) month [days not stated]—[according to the system of the Arthasāstra as implied by denomination of 2 other schools in this Malamāsa section]. It is thirty fifth year according to the [school of] *Āśvavāhās* (theirs being horse's speed). It is 40th year according to *Hastivāhās* [school] (theirs being speed of an elephant).

(22) It is quite plain that the word " Malamāsa " means a suppressed month and that it is *not* an intercalary (अधिमास) month. The latter is invariably called " Adhimāsa " in the three passages that we have quoted hitherto. Since this is a chapter on the calendar, reference to any scale of payment to horse-breeders or to elephant-breeders would be out of place. There is another construction possible and that is that the first school (of Kauṭilya) went by Solstice point, the second by the Vernal equinox point (in Aśvinī constellation) and the third was prominent either by its emphasis on the Hasta (Corvus) constellation or for the matter of fact by its preference for the Autumnal equinox (in Svāti constellation). These suggestions are only hypothetical since we have no other evidence to check them : the only sure ground is that it is *not* ' अधिमास ' (an intercalary, an added month) and that *even solar year adjustments must have been found necessary at intervals*. The bearing of this discussion is that *the precession of equinoxes was an unknown thing and the system contained fixed points of two solstices or two equinoxes*. This fact is very pertinent to our further consideration of the Vedic Gods when we are faced with a labyrinth of views as to the equinoxes, or as to the starting point in the month stated to be the first day of the bright half of Māgha ; or views that the Vedas were composed or the materials for their composition arose in regions far away from India or that traces of polar life survive in some Vedic words or rituals or sacrifices. After getting a central view-point from the present investigations based upon authentic sources free from ceremonial bias and *after its applications and the results obtained thereby*, we shall be in a position to review all these views to enable us to trace their growth behind several hypothesis and to check them all, for ascertaining their proper value.

(23) The Jain Calendar and the Arthaśāstra :— [Cf. Quotations under " Jain Texts " pp. 154-161 and notes thereon]. The Jain system of calendar is very conservative. Even the later works try to preserve the views that were held during the sixth century B. C. At times we find that there are modifications even in these books (see quotation ' M ' on p. 161), since the later authors found a considerable change in the *seasons* with reference to lunar mansions and to the lunar months. In spite of such aberrations

in the texts or in their commentaries, they collectively serve us as a guide for present investigations ; and since *the system propounded therein runs in a close parallel to the one propounded in the Arthaśāstra* we may safely switch over from the Arthaśāstra to what is related therein when we find that some particulars are not given in the former. It permits us to take a consistent and harmonious view of the calendar from both the sources and accordingly, there is ample scope for these Jain data, in our investigations related to the nature of the Vedic Gods. Since this article does not mean to serve a compendium of the data in Jain works or to explain the variance in details, the reader will have to be content with the barest mention of only the required data collected therefrom. The known Jain works are (1) "Sūryaprajñapti," (2) "Candraprajñapti," (3) "Jyctiṣkarandaka," (4) "Jambudvīpaprājñapti," (5) "Kālalokaparakāśa ". There are several others also. Those who desire to refer to the original will get a great help in the Sanskrit commentaries on some of their Māgadhī texts.

(24) The Jain system has a cycle of five solar years of a total of 1830 solar days, five luni-solar years of 62 months (60 usual luni-solar months plus two extra luni-solar months, to equate the luni-solar year to the solar one and to the completed cycle). It starts with the moment of summer solstice in the dark half of the month Śrāvaṇa, on its first day in early morning, with the moon in the Abhijit constellation then, (We have not yet seen anything of a ' Malamāsa ' therein).

(25) However we commend the system to the readers as supplementing that of the Arthaśāstra for the division of the ecliptic it gives, for the division spaces allotted to 28 constellations (the Abhijit constellation being there), and for the daily and yearly courses of the Sun and of the Moon amongst those allotted spaces and for its equinoctial and solstice points according to the data that it has adopted. We shall give here their data as briefly as possible for the facility of the readers and in a tabulated form after giving their brief description, correlated to the probably Vedic one as might be justified because of the same system of the Arthaśāstra (See pp. 154-172).

(26) Ecliptic :— In the Jain system, the ecliptic is made up of two styles. One of 1830 spaces and the other of 3660 spaces.

The difference is not at all material since the former is as good as the latter and vice-versa. We will follow the division of 3660 spaces. *The division of 360 degrees is entirely absent* and it looks that the guiding consideration has been the year of 366 days and therefore, it looks, the space division has been fixed upon just to suit this number 366.

(27) The sun completes ten spaces within a solar day (of 30 Muhūrtas); accordingly it takes him 366 days to cover 3660 spaces and to return to his old position. He completes 915 spaces in his course, from a solstice point to an equinoctial point and in the same way, further on ($3660 \div 4 = 915$). In one solar month, he covers therefore 305 spaces ($3660 \div 12 = 305$). The course of the ecliptic runs through 28 constellations amongst whom the spaces (3660) are distributed by four standards. First standard (see 'D' on p. 112) exclusively covers the constellation Abhijit to whom 42 spaces only are allotted. The second (see 'A' on p. 112) is a regular standard allotted to 15 constellations, each of which occupies 134 spaces (which the moon covers in a solar day) of the ecliptic. The third is an inferior standard (see 'B' on p. 112) assigned to six constellations, each of which occupies 67 spaces and the fourth standard is superior standard (see 'C' on p. 112) and it embraces the remaining six constellations measuring 201 spaces. The names of respective constellations and their spaces can be looked up in the table I on pp. 162-163.

(28) The moon traverses in one (solar) day (of 30 muhūrtas) 134 spaces which means that sidereal month consists of $27\frac{42}{134}$ days ($3660 \div 134 = 27\frac{42}{134}$). This is in obvious contrast to the sidereal month of 27 days stated by Kauṭilya (Arthaśāstra Ch. II, 20, 38) "सप्तविंशतिर्द्वयत्रमासः।" "The sidereal month is of 27 days". It looks that the author has left out odd figures for a round number. Supposing that he takes the system of 27 constellations and omits Abhijit with its 42 spaces, giving to his ecliptic only 3618 spaces ($3660 - 42 = 3618$ spaces), distributing 134 spaces to each constellation ($134 \times 27 = 3618$), *his other data will not work out*. From one lunation to the other, the moon covers $29\frac{1}{2}$ days according to him; while according to him it takes only 27 days for the moon to complete the circle for herself. The extra distance represented by $2\frac{1}{2}$ days ($29\frac{1}{2} - 27$) i. e. by $2\frac{1}{2} \times 134$ spaces, i. e.

by 335 space, is the distance that the sun covers between the two lunations in $29\frac{1}{2}$ days. With that speed he will take only 318'6 days to complete the whole circle (3618 spaces) while actually he ought to take, according to him 366 days. This small discussion will point out the advisability of taking up the Jain data unhesitatingly with its system of 28 constellations, the constellation Abhijit being included. The Jain data gives the period of lunation to be $29\frac{3}{4}$ days; deducting from it its sidereal period of moon of $27\frac{4}{34}$ days, we get a period of $2\frac{1}{4}$ days which the moon should traverse to complete the lunation. Multiplied by 134 spaces that the moon travels a day, we get the total amount of spaces which the sun really covers in $29\frac{3}{4}$ days; and in that way, in 366 days, he covers exactly 3660 spaces. It must be noted that *the Abhijit constellation is included in the system of 366 days and 3660 spaces and it is indispensable*, and that the text of Kautilya cannot be reconciled with any other prevalent system to-day excepting the Jain one. We shall be therefore following a perfectly right course in applying the Jain data (which are in consonance with those in Arthasāstra) for a Vedic calendar because of their being in harmony with Arthasāstra of Vedic leaning.

(29) A—The 15 constellations each of which occupies 134 spaces of the ecliptic are :—

Āsvinī, Kṛttikā, Mṛgaśīrṣa, Puṣya, Maghā, PūrvāPhālgunī, Hasta, Citrā, Anurādhā, Mūla, Pūrvāśādhā, Śravaṇa, Dhanīṣṭhā, PūrvāBhādrapadā, and Revatī—each of 134 spaces.

B—The 6 constellations each of which occupies 67 spaces are :— Bharanī, Ārdrā, Āśleṣā, Svātī, Jyēsthā and Śatabhiṣā—each of 67 spaces.

C—The 6 constellations each of which occupies 201 spaces are :— Rohiṇī, Punarvasu, UttarāPhālgunī, Viśākhā, Uttārāśādhā and UttārāBhādrapadā.—each of 201 spaces.

D—The Abhijit constellation occupies 42 spaces.

(30) Fix d Points :— [Vide Tables III and IV (on pp. 169-172)] All constellations together make up an ecliptic of 3660 spaces. The points of equinoxes are stated to be as under (they are *fixed* points) :—

Autumnal Equinox:-- When the sun completes 23 spaces of the constellation Svāti (out of its 67 spaces).

Vernal Equinox:-- When the sun completes 69 spaces of the constellation Aśvinī (out of its 134 spaces).

The solstice points are removed from these two equinoctial points exactly by 915 spaces (a quadrant) and accordingly they are as follows:--

The Summer Solstice:-- When the sun completes 43 spaces of constellation Puṣya (out of its 134 spaces).

The Winter Solstice:-- When the sun completes all the 201 spaces of constellation Uttarāśādhā, at its ending moment and when the first space of constellation Abhijit begins.

The first year of the cycle (Yuga) begins when the sun enters the 47th space of constellation Puṣya and when the moon enters the first space of constellation Abhijit early morning at a particular moment (morning of the 1st day of the dark fortnight of the month Śrāvaṇa). The position of the moon (during the cycle) keeps changing thereafter at every equinoctial and solstice point while that of the sun repeats itself mathematically.

(31) Seasons:-- [Vide Tables III and IV (on pp. 169-172)]
The rainy season begins with the summer solstice (Dakṣināyana), and the two solar months herald each succeeding season. Thus the winter solstice marks the advent of the season Śiśira. The Autumnal equinox occurs in the midst of Śarad season and the Vernal equinox comes in the midst of season Vasanta.

The course of ages did not harmonize with these periods of year and the seasons and we notice the tendency (of later writers) to modify the earlier statements or to put a new interpretation or a new nomenclature on the original text on the part of some of the Jain commentators. It can be noticed in their observations on the scriptural texts we named before.

The accompanying quotations (with notes thereon on pp. 154-161) relating to the old Jain calendar will prove to be of great interest and the tabular form (on pp. 162-172) will elucidate the course of sun through the constellations and in various months.

(32) Regent Gods :-- Next in importance are the regent gods of these constellations. They are of great importance for our comprehension of the nature of the Vedic conceptions of gods. The names of the regents are nearly uniform in the Jain and in the Brahmanic texts. They stand on a common ground which is a great point as to the essential unity between them.


(33) Re: Tables :-- The way to find out the position of moon at the moment of solstice or of equinox is shown at the end of the space table 1 (pp. 162-165).

Whether the Rāsis (signs-stellar) were known at all to the Vedic poets, or known in the nomenclature that is in vogue to-day cannot be settled now. It will be seen from the table that three constellations which encompass the stars in the sign Scorpio-Vṛścika-can be never missed by any observer of heaven. We therefore give the names of the (stellar) signs also in the tables that we give.

(35) In table II (pp. 166-168) we try to give the modern equivalents, in the current astronomic terminology to the stars of the 28 constellations with the names of their principal stars and some of their marked features and here we are much indebted to Pillai and Kaye. The shape and color of some stars of most of these constellations is given from the Jain texts and here too, we have to acknowledge our indebtedness to them. There is a good deal of variance in the number of constituent stars of some constellations. We try to give the variants although, it has to be noted that the discrepancies in these respects are a matter of individual observations and they make no material difference. (Vide table II).

(36) In the unequal spaces of constellations and in the order of enumeration we strictly follow the Jain texts as also in the data with respect to the ecliptic to the fractional length of solar days, lunar digits, lunations, sidereal year, the cycle (Yuga), and with respect to the measure of course of sun and moon amongst the 28 constellations. (Vide table I).

(37) Equal space-Ecliptic: Non-Jain : (Vide tables I and IV ; I and III).



No. 8. Shows constellations from अभिजित् to अश्लेषा (in 18 hours to 2) with हेमन्त, शिशिर and वसन्त seasons. Shows the constellations of the Divine Night and day break in Aśvini.

Red e Gods—hy H. A. Shalh.

modified ones in order to harmonize them with the changes that have come upon later on (through the fact of the precession of equinoxes), or that, in equating the old names with the modern ones, if the lunar digit has not interchanged for the solar day and vice versa. We now ask the reader to revert to the tables and to a citation of some of the important portions of the Jain texts,¹ given in the appendix before he begins to read other sections.

(39) As regards *constellations on a full moon night at full-moon* :-- Some of the Jain texts observe that in the specified three months the constellations are different from that we would naturally understand from the name of the month. Thus on a particular full moon night, moon will be with Mūla, in the (luni-solar) month Jyestha, with Dhanisthā in the month Śrāvaṇa, and with Ārdrā in the month Mārgaśīrṣa. In the rest of the months, moon will be approximately with the constellations implied by the names of the months. To-day, however, it is a matter of renewed observations.¹ (cf 'Jain Text'-'J' on pp. 158 and note thereon).

Jain Text and Notes thereon : - We cite (in appendix) some of the portions of the Jain texts which gave us the data. Since the Kālalokaprakāśa text runs in easy *Sanskrit* verses, *preserving the original material*, in citing texts we prefer it to other works for the purposes of this article. Those who would like to know more of the old calendar and its system must gather for themselves from all the texts mentioned before (in para 23).

(40) Before we resume the main work-to continue (from section I) the thread of our investigations to find out *the basic conceptions* of Vedic gods,- it will be worth while to take stock of the ground that we have covered already.

(1) From the "Meghadūta," we saw that the system of the months we should keep before us are of Pūrṇimānta type. We found it to be the case in the calendars of the Arthaśāstra and of the Jain texts.

(2) From the "Arthaśāstra," we saw that the Yuga system had its solstice and equinoctial points expressed in terms of the solar months and further implied by seasons, coupled with

¹ Quotation from Jain Texts with Notes thereon and Tables I-IV, will be found at the end of this article as Appendix pp. 154 ff.

end of the year in a bright fortnight. This system ran in close parallel to the one of the Jain calendar and that the time division of Kautilya with reference to the course of moon, though varied slightly, yet materially tallied with the Jain system in its ways and methods.

(3) We found in the Jain calendar the exact position of the sun with reference to the two solstice and two equinoctial points and we got two complete systems of old division of ecliptic with reference to constellations and solar months.

(4) We then get at the Zodiacal constellations and their regent gods.

(41) Now we take a step further and see if some of the constellations and phenomena (that arose by course of sun traversing the same) enable us *to understand and appreciate* the Vedic singers better than before. It will be found that in one or another form, these constellations and the delineation of old equinoxes and solstices have been preserved for us ; the writer has found *that the drama of Vikramorvaśīya of Kālidāsa is such a work*. The Śākuntala and Raghuvamśa too serve the same purpose. So too, the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa. They are, in themselves relatively *later* growths consistent with the earlier Vedic one forming one unit as it were by continuity ; but all of them enable us a better approach to the prime source—the Vedas. With these brief notices here, the writer passes on now to the consideration of the Vedic gods and goddesses. The writer has put on paper some of his researches with reference to the Dramas of Kālidāsa in his article.¹

SECTION—III : VERNAL EQUINOX : AŚVINS and UṢAS :

(42) Goddess Uṣas and the Aśvins :— We now refer to the goddess Uṣas, " the most graceful creation of Vedic poetry." (Mac. p. 46). She is the goddess of Dawn. " She removes the black robe of night (I, 113, 14,)" (Mac. p. 47). In her ordinary aspect, she heralds the physical day — but it is then the day of the mortals. *There is a day of the immortals* which too is ushered in by the Uṣas. The conception of the northern passage of sun

¹ "The Astronomical Data in the Dramas of Kālidāsa." It will be published in the A. B. I., later on. He hopes to reduce other researches to writing in course of time. They are in progress.

(*north of equator*) connoting such a day of gods and his southern course their night is a familiar conception in the old literature. We read in the *SūryaSiddhānta* I. 13 and XII. 45 that from Aries upto Libra, it is the region of the gods, the rest being that of Asuras.

“मासैर्द्वादशभिर्वर्षं दिव्यं तदहुरुच्यते” ॥ १३ ॥

“मेषानां देवभागस्थे देवानां याति दर्शनम् ॥ .

अमुराणां तुलादौ तु सूर्यस्तद्भागसंचरः ” ४५ ॥

In the *PañcaSiddhāntikā*, (G. Thibaut's translation, p. 86 (see note to para 4 and quotations from this text) Ch. XIII, 27, we read.--

“For those who dwell on the back of Meru the sun once risen remains visible for six months, while he moves in the six signs beginning with Aries; for the Asuras he is visible as long as he is in the latter (half of the ecliptic)”. *Manu*° I, 67 says that the (human) year is a night and day of the gods, the northern passage being day, the southern being night.”

“दैवे रात्र्यहनी वर्षं प्रविभागस्तयोः पुनः !

अहस्तत्रोदगयनं रात्रिः स्यादक्षिणायनम् ” ॥

The *Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa* (III, 9, 22) “एकं वा एतद्देवानामहः यत्संवत्सरः ” ॥ says that the one day of gods is the *Samvatsara* (Tilak, pp. 68-70). The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (II, 1, 3). prefers to take three seasons *Vasanta*, *Griṣma* and *Varṣā* to connote the northern passage of the sun and the rest of the three seasons to connote his southern course, the former associated with the gods and the latter with the *Pitrs* “वसंतो ग्रीष्मो वर्षाः । ते देवा ऋतवः शरद्धेमंतः शिशिरस्ते पितरो.....स (सूर्यः) यत्रोदगावर्तते । देवेषु तर्हि भवति...यत्र दक्षिणावर्तते पितृषु तर्हि भवति ” ॥

(*Śatapatha Br.* II, 13) (Dixit. p. 34.)

(43) For the gods thus as in human affairs, there is an intervening period between night and day with its goddess, when that long night of the gods terminates. That leads us to the equinoctial points (with northern course of sun on equator), to the mid-point of the two solstices, since the year commences with a solstice point. We saw that the equinoctial points are in the constellations *Āśvini*

and Svāti and accordingly their regent gods have their rightful place with the goddess Uṣas in one form or another. We first dwell upon the Vernal Equinox, upon the two Ásvins who preside over this equinoctial constellation of Ásvinī, the half of which (vide tables III and IV) goes over the divine night (cf. " She removes the black robe of night,") and the other half over the divine day. "Yāska quotes a passage stating that 'one (of the two Ásvins) is called *the son of night, the other the son of Dawn*' [Nir. 12, 2.]. (Mac. p. 49). RV. cf. VII 16, 1. " The time of their appearance is often said to be the early dawn, when darkness still stands among the ruddy cows (X. 61, 4) and they yoke their car to descend to earth and receive the offerings of worshippers (I, 22, 2, etc.) Uṣas awakes them (VIII, 9, 17). They follow after Uṣas in their car, (VIII, 5, 2). *At the yoking of their car Uṣas is born* (X, 39, 12.) " Mac. p. 50). What a splendid picture of the occurrence of Vernal Equinox when the nature shakes off its slumber—when it is rejuvenated !

" Uṣas is borne on a car which is shining (VII, 78, 1), brilliant (I, 23, 7) "... " She is drawn by steeds which are ruddy (VII, 75, 6) "... " She is also described as being drawn by ruddy kine or bulls (' go ' : I, 92, 2; I, 124, 11 ; V, 80, 3)—" Mac. p. 47. " Both the horses and the cows probably represent the ruddy rays of the morning light. "—Mac. p. 47. " Her radiant beams appear like herds of cattle (IV, 52, 2-4) "... " She opens the doors of darkness as the cows their stall ' (I, 92, 4.) " Mac. p. 47. " The gods are often described as ' waking with Uṣas (I, 14, 9 etc.) ' Mac. p. 47. The divine day has commenced.

(44) It will be evident that the twins gods Ásvins, the regents of the constellation Ásvinī at the equinoctial point, are thought of by the Vedic poets in connection with the termination of the divine night and also in connection with the commencement of the divine day. *this is the divine character of the Uṣas which brings her*

¹ The imagery after the cowstalls and after herds of cattle seems to have been furnished by the village life of India where cattle set out (cows after being milked early) of the village at daybreak for grazing. They return at dusk to their homes when the cows are milked again. Both the period of time of their outgoing and incoming, particularly the latter, is considered very auspicious time of " गोरुतः ", the time of Dawn and Dusk, when clouds of dust rise out of the movement of the cows.

together with the *Ásvins*. It is not a phenomena of the northern or of the polar regions but a phenomena of return of Spring. In that way we see that the "Dawn herself is born of Night" (I. 123, 9) "Mac. p. 12. "...She removes the black robe of Night (I. 113, 14) "Mac. p. 47.

SECT ON—IV: From VERNAL to the AUTUMNAL
EQUINOX; SEVERAL GODS and GODDESSES.

(45) Autumnal Equinox. — It will be seen that the divine daybreak at the Vernal equinox explains the association of *Uṣas* with the twin gods *Ásvins*. At that time, *nature* herself has worked a change towards her own rejuvenation; there is little of human efforts or activities that counts then.

It is however different at the approach of the Autumnal equinox. The progress of the seasons, after the Vernal one, particularly from about the Summer solstice (rains) upto the Autumnal equinox is associated with human efforts in the form of agricultural operations and of a subsequent good *harvest*. Therein several natural forces are supposed to participate, advancing or aiding the human efforts or impeding their course. During the rainy season the earth gets flooded and the religious and other regulated activities (which proceed from the correct apprehension of the measurement of time made through *Śāṅku* and shadow) fall into abeyance. Days and nights are clouded and therefore the sunlight, the stellar movements, and the lunar progress generally get out of observation. These are the "impediments" of those days; while the beneficent influences are in the form of a good harvest and the resuscitation of the vegetation on account of the profuse supply of water from sky. The Vedic songs seem to be an attempt to trace the forces that range behind these developments that are at work and which forces are behind the human attempts in reality; the songs reflect the glory of the divine grace that is instrumental in helping them and also in overpowering the manifold impediments that they are subject to,—and what are human efforts without these divine graces? The utmost tribute that is paid to these gods is their celebration and the humble offerings (of the season) accompanied with their recognition and emulation, with prayers and devotion. It is natural that the poets—the Vedic seers—try to exhaust the enumeration of

all these forces. It is therefore impossible for them to detach or isolate any one agency from the rest that are at work. The principal god of this period is Indra and the main obstructive force is the serpent Ahi or Vṛtra. The serpentine constellation (Hydra Ahi: Vṛtra) near summer solstice ends just at the Autumnal equinox covering a fourth part of the Zodiac from Āśleṣā and of the southern sky near it from Puṣya upto Svāti. Accordingly, most of the regent gods of these intervening constellations (Puṣya to Svāti-Bṛhaspati to Vāyu)¹ come into the fray and help Indra one way or another. There are other stars like Sirius and Canopus and star-groups like Ursa Majoris-the Saptarsis which are also involved in this period; they too are brought in, in one form or another. From their occurrence as well as from their heliacal rise, the northern constellation Saptarṣi (Great Bear-Ursa Majoris) helps Indra as also the two southern stars Sirius Rudra-Śiva (A-Canis Majoris S. 16°34') and the star Canopus (A-Argo Navis S. 52°39') known as Agastya. If we leave out these stars and constellations associated with the seasons, associated with the resuscitation of nature and fruition of agriculture, we will not be able to understand the Vedic songs. There are many regent gods of constellations from the Summer solstice onwards. Bṛhaspati helps Indra. Then the Pitṛs-the Saptarṣis-combine in the image of Bṛhaspati and they take an active part. So does Aryaman; so do Savitṛ, Twastṛ, Sarasvatī and gods Vāyu-who are also called the Maruts and the Mātariśvan. The last one forms a terminus to the Serpentine demon Hydra. They are spoken generally in plural. They are of greater importance than most of the others enumerated since their occurrence is associated with harvest and with the Autumnal equinox; and they form a terminus to the heliacal rise of the Saptarṣi also. The star Svāti, being in the north, rises earlier by about an hour just after the Hasta and earlier than the Citrā constellations which are in south and *therefore* the scope of Maruts gets more extended to the regions of Hasta and Citrā. The physical characteristics of Vāyu-wind-

¹ This will explain the name "Guruvāyur" god of Malabar in South India at a celebrated place of pilgrimage and further, of the beneficent agency that is celebrated through this god.

extend the scope even during the rainy season and therefore, of all the gods, they are the most associated with Indra. Since Agastya rises in autumn at different places on different days (being in the south) it also gets associated with the Autumnal equinox as it were, marking its complete rise through the association of early rising of the star Svāti. It is through the Agastya, that Brh̥aspati Viṣṇu and Agni enter into the fray against the serpent Vṛtra—the Hydra—to help and to associate with Indra. Soma too gets in, a being of important consideration, at the Autumnal equinox at Svāti.¹ The following pages will unfold what is told herein.

(46) It is impossible therefore to keep a numerical sequence or to concentrate exclusively upon the characteristics of one single god in the subsequent paras without taking into account those of the others. It is impossible to proceed with the basic conception of the gods that we now describe, in the detached manner we could describe that of Varuṇa, or of Mitra, or of the Uṣas and the Aśvins. Varuṇa and Mitra are indispensable throughout the year where Light and Time are involved; therefore they find a place along with the one or the other god of this period particularly at the Autumnal equinox. After these preliminary observations, we proceed with further examination or explanation of the distinctive features of these gods, as best and as short as it can be possible.

(47) Vāyu.— This god is the regent of the Svāti constellation (A-Bōōtes-Arcturus) at the Autumnal equinox as we saw from the calendar. “Vāta is spoken of as producing ruddy lights (X, 168, 1) and of making the Dawns shine (I, 134, 3)” — Mac. p. 83. It is the *evening* of the Gods, as Aśvins marked their daybreak.

(48) The Svāti star is N. 19°/42' while Hasta (Corvus) stars are S. 16° to S. 24° and the Citrā star is S. 10°/ 38'. Vide table II for the modern equivalents. The phenomenon on the Indian horizon (it is not polar) is that the Svāti and Citrā stars make their appearance in the East soon after the Hasta group completes

¹ See illustration maps.

its rise.¹ Thus the very early advent of Svāti is noted as its swift course. It is not unusual to call stars as 'birds' as we noticed before in the section on the God Varuṇa. Hence Svāti at times is depicted as a swift bird-swifter than any of its prototype. Accordingly, it earns the name of the swiftest bird which is the reputed *Eagle*. "Vāyu is fond of Soma, to which he is invited to come with his teams and the *first* draught of which he obtains as his share (also in company with Indra, I, 135, 4), for he is the swiftest of the gods (SB. XIII, 1, 2-7, etc.)" - Mac. p. 82. "Vāyu reached the goal first and Indra second in a race which the gods ran for the first draught of Soma (AB. II, 25) - Mac. p. 82. These statements point to early rise of Svāti over that of others. Unlike the Aśvins, they are associated with Indra as Maruts. They strike Vṛtra [(Hydra-vide Vṛtra), the serpentine demon Ahi (Mac. p. 152)], assisted by Indra (I, 23, 9) - Mac. p. 81;" and "with them, Indra gains light (VIII, 65, 4) and finds the cows (1, 6, 5)" - Mac. pp. 80 and 81. "And the Maruts sang a song and pressed Soma, for Indra when he slew the dragon (V, 29, 2; V 30, 6)" - Mac. p. 80. They are keepers of cow-stalls. "Indra produced cows for *Trita* (Gnomon-vide *Trita*) from the dragon and delivered the cow-stalls to Dadhvañc and Mātariśvan (X, 48, 2)" - Mac. p. 71. The cows are light (vide cows) and at the Autumnal equinox, the cowstalls refer to

¹ Owing to differences in magnitudes of these stars, to the variations in atmosphere at this period of the year, at various places in India, owing to the wide range of Indian latitude (N. 9° to N. 35°) as also to diversities in methods of computations of rise of stars, while there is no good *reliable* guide in these respects for calculating either heliacal rising or heliacal setting, and last but not the least, owing to the limited knowledge of the mathematical phase of astronomy on the part of the present writer, for all these reasons combined-it is impossible to be exact in details or to be precise in particulars. That task devolves on more capable shoulders.

The present writer is however confident as to the truth of the generalities that he is able to present from his personal observations and from the data he is fortunate enough to collect and interpret from the literary classics and from the reliable authors. Even then, it is difficult for him to decide if the classical authorities adopted Kashmir (N. 34° 2') as their standard for their reference to the heliacal rise and setting of stars-such as Agastya-Canopus-or that they stuck to Ujjain, (N. 24°-Kaye) the standard Indian meridian, for this purpose. Kauṭilya's measure for the longest day of year applies to the latitude of Kashmir which is therefore remarkable for our considerations.

(period of or portion of) Bóotes-group of stars which are near the sixth star (Vasiṣṭha) of Saptarṣi. The Dadhyañc is the Ásvini constellation—since ‘to Dadhyañc the Ásvins gave the head of a horse (I, 117, 22)’ (Mac. p. 141). Soma is light and its transformations (vide Soma). The connection of Agni with this god explains the myth of the eagle bringing fire (vide Agni). The terrestrial Agni is lighted up at the daily dawn and at the dusk of the Autumnal equinox which is another celestial form of Agni (vide Agni). Svāti—the Maruts—are thus associated with Vṛtra, Indra, Trita, Cows, Dadhyañc, Soma, Agni and Saptarṣi.

(49) The golden colour of the star Svāti (Arcturus) imparts a good deal to this imagery. The Māruts are “golden, of sun-like brightness, like blazing fires, of ruddy aspects (VI, 66, 2; VII, 59, 11; VIII, 7, 7)” — Mac. p. 78. Their mantles, ornaments, helmets, cars, wheels of their cars, are all golden; their coursers are all ruddy, tawny and golden footed—Mac. p. 79. This ruddy nature imparts to them as Mātariśvan much of the attributes of gold or fire: but really Mātariśvan is not Agni. As a star, it does partake of the nature of Agni (light)—but “when as Mātariśvan he was fashioned in his mother (amimita Mātari: cp. I, 141, 5) he became the swift flight of wind (III, 29, 11)” — Mac. p. 71. He is therefore a Wind god, regent of Svāti.

(50) Trita: Soma:— “Indra and Trita in three or four passages perform the same feat, that of slaying a demon.” ... “Trita is associated with the Maruts in the thunderstorm.”—Moreover he finds Agni, kindles Agni in heaven, and takes up his abode in human dwellings, clearly as a form of Agni. His abode is remote and hidden, and Soma is there.” “In the Avesta he is once (Yasna IX, 10) described as the third man who prepared Ha ma (Soma) for the corporeal world (Āthwya-Āptya being the second) and once (Vend. XX, 2) as the first healer who received from the Ahura Mazda ten thousand healing plants which grow round the white Haoma, the tree of immortality.” —Mac. p. 68. “Trita cherishes (him who is like) Varuṇa in the ocean (IX, 95, 4)” —Mac. p. 68. “Soma occupies the secret place near the two pressing stones of Trita (IX, 102, 2) and is besought to bring wealth in a stream on the sides (Prṣṭhesu) of Trita—(IX, 102, 3). “Soma caused the sun along with the sisters to shine on the summit (sṛnu)

of *Trita* (IX, 37, 4)'' -Mac. p. 67/68. Such are the distinctive features of *Trita*.

(51) Who is this *Trita*? Connected with *Varuṇa*, with two stones of *Trita*, and the abode in human dwellings suggest to us the *Śaṅku* the Gnomon with its two side quadrants, with its central portion pointed to *Varuṇa* (the *Ahuramazda*). Naturally, as a means to the measurement of time he is, associated with the *Maruts* (the regent god of *Svāti*) at the Autumnal Equinox and with *Indra* in the *Vṛtra*-fight. Hence, what shines on his summit is the Light which alights there, for its conversion into Time (at Autumnal Equinox) and which is here described as "*Soma*" on the summit. The idea of fire being brought out of sky or the idea of *Agni* produced from rock, by the bird is very well known in the *Mātariśvan* myth. -(Mac. pp. 71-72). The summit known as '*Sānu*' of the gnomon and the association of the *Maruts* would in themselves suggest the Autumnal equinox when the fire is lighted up. (Vide *Agni*). "*Soma* is purified by *Trita*" (IX, 34, 4)-Mac. p. 67, seems to refer to the (calendar or) Time checked at the Autumnal equinox, when the measurement of Time is checked by the Light (*Prabhā*-'*Palabhā*') that is cast on the gnomon on the mid-day of the day of the Autumnal equinox. We may read again the description in para 50.

(52) "...In one passage, in the middle of a *Varuṇa* hymn, *Trita* is described as one in whom wisdom is centered, as the nave in the wheel, (VIII, 41, 6)''-Mac. p. 68. This seems to refer to the manifold beneficent activities which arise out of the Time measured out of the gnomon. (The conception of *Manu* is a parallel case in this respect). The plight of *Trita* in a well (Mac. p. 67) seems to be a picture of the gnomon in the rainy season when the earth gets flooded with water and the gnomon gets surrounded by water, rescued by *Bṛhaspati* (Mac. p. 67) (in *Śarad*) when 'the seven rays' (= *Saptarṣi*-) rise heliacally in Autumn.

(53) *Soma*: What is *Soma*? It will be easy to follow the basic conception of this god if we refer to his *Vedic* colour.¹

¹ In para 50/51, under "*Trita*" we read that the '*Haoma*' is white in *Avesta*. If redness and whiteness mean little difference with reference to Light, then *Vedic Soma* would secondarily be the regent god of moon, of Light and Time in the *Vedic Luni-solar* calendar.

Soma is "brown, (babhru) or ruddy (aruṇa), but most frequently as tawny (hari). Thus Soma is a branch of a ruddy tree (X, 94, 3), it is a ruddy milked shoot (VI¹, 98, 1) etc." (Mac. p. 105), the part of Soma plant which is pressed is called *Aṃśu* (IX, 67, 28) - Mac. p. 104. So far the colour of Soma is concerned there is little doubt that *the colour is that of Light*. He is an embodiment of Light and in that way the following narration becomes significant. He caused the Sun to shine (IX, 28, 5; IX, 37, 4); caused the lights of the sky to shine (IX, 85, 9) and produced the sun in the waters (IX, 42, 1). He caused the sun to rise, impelled it, obtained it and bestowed it, and caused the Dawns to shine." (Mac. pp. 109-110). "He makes his worshippers participate in the sun (IX, 4, 5) and finds light for them (IX, 35, 1): He found the light (IX, 59, 4) and wins light and heaven (IX, 3, 2)"... "placing light in the sun (VI, 44, 23-24; VI, 47, 3-4)" - Mac. p. 110. The elements of the Dawns are two: its Time of occurrence (Equinoxes and the daily grandeur of light). The god Soma who makes Uṣas shine therefore constitutes "Soma" as the god of Light, *the light which pervades in the stars too and in the universe*. But at times, the light gets transformed when it reaches the *terrestrial world* and one such transformation (on Śaṅku) is "Time": and Soma becomes secondarily, a god of both Light and Time. In that way, we can understand the following passages. "The term *Madhu*, which in connection with the Aśvins means 'honey' or 'mead' (very suggestive of the Vernal season and of the bees which are then active), comes to be applied, in the general sense of 'sweet draught' not only to milk (payas) and ghee (ghṛta), but especially to the Soma juice (IV, 27, 5, VIII, 69, 6): Mythologically Madhu is the equivalent of Soma when the latter means the celestial Ambrosia (*Amṛta*): Conversely, *Amṛta* is frequently used as an equivalent of ordinary Soma (V, 2, 3; VI, 37, 3 etc.; VS. VI, 34; SB. IX, 5, 1, 8). King Soma when pressed is *Amṛta* (VS. XIX, 72). Here we may remember the two pressing stones of Trita, the two quadrants on the sides of Śaṅku. Another expression is 'Somyam Madhu.' 'Soma Mead' (IV, 26, 5; VI, 20, 3)" - Mac. p. 105. The connection with Aśvins at the Vernal Equinox is expressed through Madhu while with Vāyu it is told that Soma the *purified draught* is offered exclusively to Vāyu and Indra




FIG. 7. Shows constellations from hour 12 to 21 with seasons, Soma, Soma and Soma. Shows Divine Evening the Soma twilight, with Soma and Soma, the harvest and Soma, sacrifices and celebrations of this period. Shows constellations of Divine Night.

Vedic Gods—by H. A. Shah.

(Mac. p. 106). Thus Soma is connected with the two equinoctial points,- "the epithet Śucipa 'drinking clear (Soma)' being distinctive of Vāyu (cf. Mac. p. 82)." -Mac. p. 106. The connection of Soma with Vāyu makes it pre-eminently a god of the Autumnal equinox, Vāyu being regent god(s) of Svāti.

(54) It looks as if there are other forms of Soma. "Soma *clothes himself in waters*, that streams of water flow after him, when he *desires to clothe himself in cows (in milk-IX, 2, 3-4)*" -Mac. p. 106. It will be worth *investigation* how this transformation is alluded to in a variety of ways in the Vedic poetry. According to RV. VII, 47, 3 and VII, 49, 2-4, Āpaḥ are *brilliant*. *The waters seem to be regarded as a form of light* and if that be really so, Varuṇa, who is the lord of Light, can well be said to be the lord of Waters or the 'Lord of ocean' (Mac. p. 25). Cf. "Varuṇa *clothes himself in the waters*. (IX, 90, 2 ; cp. VIII 69, 11-12.)" -Mac. p. 25. We may as well see the truth of Trita being styled "Āptya," because of the connection of Śaṅku (gnomon) Trita with Light (Āpaḥ=waters=Light).

(55) In the above passages, it is significant that Soma desires to *clothe himself in cows*. It seems that "cow" is an expression which signifies light wherever the cows are ruddy or shining or in heavens. The cowstalls then would suggest beams or flood of light as we would notice in the Dawns or in the myriads of stars (of Bootes group).

(56) The Soma drink which makes the gods immortal and which is the Amṛta seems to be nothing but a figurative expression for the *immortality where the Light and Time continue* and which is the case with the gods-the stars-who are an embodiment of these elements. The life that the mortals get, it seems, is made up of restricted Light and Time and of what trickles down through the spaces from sky in the form of water, rain-drops and the ultimate juice that is created in the vegetable world and which fills the udders of the cows. The convention for a fixed standard of time for human or religious affairs seems to have selected the time of the Autumnal equinox when the living world enjoys once again the mercy of this god-the mercy of light and "water" in its abundance, at harvest time after a good rainy season, and at

the end of the Hydra constellation. Soma is therefore truly called "the milk (pīyūṣa) of heaven (IX, 51, 2 etc.), is purified in heaven (IX 83, 2; IX 86, 22, etc.). He flows with his streams to the dear places of heaven (IX 12, 8), ...he occupies heaven (IX 85, 9), he is in heaven (SB. III, 4, 3, 13) or is lord of heaven (IX 86, 11-13)." -Mac. p. 111.

(57) Āpaḥ:— The nature of Āpaḥ being wholly or partly a nature of Soma-Light-various other references in connection with Āpaḥ can be easily followed. It is said that "they abide *where the gods are and the seat of Mitra and Varuṇa is* (X, 30, 1)....They are *beside the sun and the sun is with them* (I, 23, 17)" -Mac. p. 85. This is evidently a reference to Śaṅku, to light on it and to the time of Autumnal equinox. The gods are conceived as stars in heaven which is the ocean. ["The atmosphere is often called a sea (samudra) as the abode of the celestial waters..." -Mac. p. 10)] the lord of all being Varuṇa. The Āpaḥ "are the goddesses who follow the path of the gods (VII, 47, 3)" -Mac. p. 85. The idea seems to develop in the Apsarases, the divine (water) females; and along with the Soma, they are naturally associated with the Autumnal equinox: "The Apsarases of the sea are described as flowing to Soma (IX, 78, 3), with reference to the water that is mixed with the juice," -Mac. p. 134. The chapter on Āpaḥ has to be read in connection with that on the Apsarases. Since Soma is preeminently placed with Vāyu, the Apsarases are placed with Gandharvas who seem to be none else than the Stars (Bōotes) at the Autumnal equinox:—"In several passages *Gandharva* is closely connected with some form of celestial light. Thus he is brought into relation with the sun, 'the golden winged bird the messenger of Varuṇa' (X, 123, 6), with the sun bird (X, 177, 2), with the sun-steed (I, 163, 2), with Soma likened to the sun (IX, 85, 12)" -Mac. p. 136. The golden winged bird mentioned here is not sun but the golden star Svāti (Arcturus) at the Autumnal equinox; and therefrom (from one equinox), the opposite point of the Vernal equinox steps in, in the imagery of the steeds. We read that "Gandharva is sometimes connected with the waters. 'Gandharva in the waters' and the 'aqueous nymph' are alluded to as the parents of Yama and Yamī (X, 10, 4) -Mac. p. 137. The Yama seems to

be also a conception of Gnomon (Śaṅku) with reference to the *mortals* in connection with Time when memory of the dead is resolved into Time-oblivion. "He is associated with the departed *fa'h-ra*, particularly with the Āṅgirasas (Mac. p. 171)...His father is Vivasvat (X, 14, 5)" -Mac. p. 172....Agni, Yama, Mātariśvan are mentioned together as the names of the one being (I, 164, 46)" -Mac. p. 171. The *Āṅgirasas* are Saptarṣis (vide Āṅgiraśa), the *Vivaśvat* is the Pole star-Dhruva (vide Vivasvat); and their close association with Mātariśvan is evident since the gnomon at the Autumnal equinox is just what is herein referred to. The *two dogs of Yamī* seem to be the two side quadrants of the gnomon which give morning and evening time, the sister Yamī being the light which alights on the Śaṅku itself at the Autumnal equinox as also on the side quadrants in that period. We will not dilate upon it. "Yama's foot-fetter (padbīśa) is spoken of as parallel to the bond of Varuṇa (X, 97, 16)" -Mac. p. 172. The bonds of Varuṇa are the polar longitudes and latitudes "In their dialogue, in the RV. (X, 10, 4) Yama and Yamī call themselves children of Gandharva and the water nymph (Apyā yosā)" Mac. p. 172.

Thus the chapter of "waters"-Āpaḥ-leads us to a consideration of Soma, Light, Gandharvas, the Apsarases, the Yama and Yamī because light is associated with the gnomon, Varuṇa and with Time and thus with the mortals.

(58) Āpaḥ too are connected with the Agni as we saw just before. It is expressive in more than one way. "As mothers they produce Agni" (X, 91, 6) -Mac. p. 85. As waters, it seems that they refer to (here producing) the heliacal rise of the star *Agastya*,¹ which comes at the end of the rainy season in sign

¹ Cf. Raghu. IV, 21 "प्रससादोदयादम्भः कुम्भयोर्नेर्महोजसः" Waters became clear on the (heliacal) rise of Canopus-born of Kumbha-of great effulgence. Mallinātha comments:—"अगस्त्यः कुम्भसंभव इत्यमरः । अगस्त्योदये जलानि प्रसीदन्ति इत्यागमः ।" From Dowson's "Hindu Classical Dictionary" we learn under 'Agastya' that—"Agastya and Vasiṣṭha are said in R̥gveda to be the offspring of Mitra and Varuṇa, whose seed fell from them at the sight of Urvāśī and the commentator Śāyana adds that Agastya was born in a water-jar ('Kumbha') as a "fish of great lusture," whence he was called 'Kalāsūta,' 'KumbhaSambhava' and 'Ghaṭodbhava'. From his parentage he was called 'Mātṛāvāruṇī' and Aurvaśeya." (continued on next page)

Virgo. The more of it can be discussed when we refer to Agni and the Apānnapāt god—the son of waters. Let us repeat that “sometimes at least the celestial waters were regarded as containing or identical with the heavenly Soma, the beverage of Indra”—Mac. p. 86. “The *atmosphere* is often called a sea (samudra) as the abode of the celestial waters.” (Mac. p. 10). The “heavenly river Ganges” is a very familiar expression for the Milky Way (Via Lactea).

(59) Aditi: She is said to be the mother of the gods and accordingly her stellar nature is to be thought of first. “The

(continued from previous page)

From “Agastya in the Tamil Land,” by K. N. Sivaraja Pillai, B. A.—University of Madras—p. 2, we learn that:—“Agastya is known as ‘Kalaśaja ‘KumbhaSambhava’... (the pot-born), from the fact that he was born from the seed of Mitra received and preserved in a pot (‘Kumbha’). The story runs that once upon a time both Mitra and Varuṇa had a sort of love contest in respect of the heavenly damsel Urvaśī and that they could not do anything more than depositing their fertile seed, one in a pot and other in the sea. In time, Agastya was born from the pot and Vasiṣṭha, one of the reputed Saptarṣis (Zeta Ursa Majoris—Mizar) started his life from the sea.”

The above quotations show how the story develops round the word ‘Kumbha’.

It is apparent to the writer that the word ‘Kumbha’ is here misunderstood and so too the variants of that word. As in the ‘Hasta’ word (vide ‘kari’) which means hand as well as the trunk of an elephant, “Kumbha” is both ‘the pot’ as well as ‘the forehead of an elephant.’ We have to take here the latter sense of the word: meaning thereby, “the (heliacal) rise of the star Agastya when the constellation Hasta (Corvus) is not visible (in season Śarad-Autumn); when the sun covers those degrees wherein that portion of Hasta (Gamma, Epsilon and Alpha Corvus)—the forehead region of elephantine head—is heliacally set. Perhaps the same period should hold good for the heliacal rise of the star Mizar-Vasiṣṭha. Origin of both these stars is connected with Urvaśī which is Celestial Equator and Equatorial shadow later on (cf. present writer’s paper “Astronomical Data in the Darīmas of Kālidāsa”) which would point to the circumstance of completion of their heliacal rise at all places in India when the sun is approaching the celestial equator with the approach to the equinoctial star Svāti which rises earlier with the Hasta constellation (vide paras 45 and 48).

It is to be noted that the star is styled a “fish” of great lustre. This way of calling the star a *fish* will help us in interpreting some of the ‘miracles’ of the Gospels (Mt. XIV, 13-21; XV, 32-39) and other portions therein where the disciples are called (Mt. IV, 19-20) ‘fishers’ and made ‘fishers of Men’ as well as the Flood or the Deluge stories wherein the ‘fish’ (Canopus-Agastya) plays a prominent part. . . (continued on the next page)

gods are said to have been born from Aditi, the Waters, and Earth (X, 63, 2) " -Mac. p. 121. Their daily course would naturally associate them with the earth and water. She is bright and luminous (I, 136, 3) " -Mac. p. 120 and hence, her stellar nature is definite. " She is *widely expanded* " (V, 46, 6) -Mac. p. 120 which is therefore a description of the Milky Way-Via Lactea the Heavenly Ganges. Aditi is the mother of Mitra and Varuṇa " (VIII, 25, 3 ; X, 36, 3 ; X, 132, 6) " -Mac. p. 120. It looks that the Vedic conception of the prime cause of light and stars has passed on even beyond from the Varuṇa-the Pole Star, to Aditi-the infinite cluster of the Stars. We can now easily understand the " Ādityas. " " In X, 5, 7, it is stated that the existent and non-existent were in the womb of Aditi, in the birth-place of Dakṣa. " -Mac. p. 46.

(60) Cow : We read that " the beams of Dawn are personified as cows, which draw her car (Mac. p. 47) " -Mac. p. 150. The Maruts, the regent god(s) of Svāti, are sons of cow : " the cow *Prśū* (V, 52, 16) or simply a cow is their mother (VIII, 83, 1) and they bear the epithet " *Gomātaraḥ* " -' having a cow for their mother ' (I, 85, 3 ; cp. VIII, 20, 8) " -Mac. p. 78. The opening of the cow-

(continued from previous page)


Because the fishes do not wink, the stars have been styled at times ' fishes ' as may be seen from the lexicon of Amara, III, 218, " *सुरमत्स्याव-निमिषौ ।* " To the same effect we read in the drama ' Vikramorvaśīya of Kālidāsa after III, 17, " *किं वा स्वर्गे स्मर्तव्यम् । न वा ज्ञयते न वा पीयते । केवलमनिमिषैर्नय-नेर्मीनां विद्वन्त्यन्ते ॥* " . The gliding through of these ' fishes ' in the heavenly expanse might have given rise to the idea of the heavens as a vast " Sea, " the Pole Star Dhruva-Varuṇa being the suzerain, styled also as the Lord of the Sea. " Close association and the nature of Mitra and Varuṇa (in north) has been noted already ; and Canopus in the south may well get in the picture. The seed of Varuṇa (in the northern quarter) may well be associated with the birth of Vasistha in the " sea " in-North.

As noted before (in paras 45 and 48) the early appearance of the pearl-like star Citrā (Spica -Alpha Virgo) along with the rise of Hasta (Corvus) constellation may well have given rise to the conception of a popular myth expressed in " *मौक्तिकं न गजं गजे* " of valuable pearl to be found (in the ' Kumbha ') -in the forehead of an elephant.


It will be realised how the words " Kumbha, " " Fish " and " Sea " are applicable in the old myths and stories. That is how the *Elephant-headed* classical god Gaṇeśa comes into being, the heliacal rise of the Star Canopus-Agastya when the " Hasta " (Corvus -' kari ' -) disappears heliacally.

stalls at the dawn may therefore refer to the equinoctial time when it is not a daily affair that is intended thereby. But for the Autumnal equinox, the Maruts would not be in the picture. The star group (representing the cows) which is connected with the Svāti (Aroturus=A-Böotes) star is the Böotes cluster of stars (N. 20° to N. 50°) which has at its other (northern) end the well known star Arundhati (Alcor) and the star Vasiṣṭha (Sixth of the Saptarṣi-Zeta Ursæ Majoris). It seems that the famous cow of plenty- 'Nandini-Kāmadhenu.' -Surabhi-Devaki-has some reference to this star group (including Svāti), if we remember that the Nandini-Kāmadhenu is in the keeping of Arundhati and Vasiṣṭha (Cf. Raghuvamśa, I, 56, 82; II, 25, 62ff.). The star group Böotes connected with Svāti and Alcor occupies nearly 20 degrees of (northern) passage of sun in heaven and the king Dillipa took 21 days in attending her. He met the lion (*red* coloured Svāti) on the final day which perhaps means that the star Svāti-Arcturus- was there after 21 days. We have therefore to consider this period and this constellation Böotes in our thoughts of opening of the cow-stalls at the autumnal 'dawn.' For further reference to cow, see Appendix re "Aryaman and Bhaga" on pp. 151-153.


(61) Āṅgirasas :— The fathers-or the Pitṛs-are the regents of constellation Maghā (Alpha Leo-Regulus). It seems that they refer to the constellation Saptarṣi (Ursæ Majoris) of seven stars, the last of which occupies the spaces at the Autumnal equinox. Yama is associated with the departed fathers (Pitṛs), particularly the Āṅgirasas (X, 14, 3 and 5)-Mac. p. 170, and 171. "Accompanied by them Indra pierces Vala (II, 11, 20)" -Mac. p. 142. "To them Indra disclosed the cows (VIII, 52, 3) for them he opened the stalls (I, 51, 3; I. 134, 4)" -Mac. p. 142. The action of killing the demon and opening of the cow-stall does connect them (through Hydra and Böotes) with the Autumnal equinox at Svāti. Hence it will be proper if we understand them as Saptarṣis from this latter point and from the former point which refers to their regency of Maghā. We may read this chapter accordingly. "The Vasiṣṭhas claim to have first awakened Uṣas with their hymns (VII, 80, 1)" -Mac. p. 47. This seems to refer to the heliacal rise of Vasiṣṭha in the season autumn, with cessation of rain and approach of harvest season when sacrifices are resumed. cf. Rbhua.




No. 1. Shows Sanku
(Trisūla).



No. 2. Shows old Sanku with Dhruva (N.) Agastya
(S.) and Sun (W.) काल the महाकाल मित्र, यम, मनु, शिव etc.



No. 3. Shows Sanku with reference to
वृत्र= Hydra and constellations from पुनर्वसु to स्वाति.



(62) Vivasvat-Manu: "Soma dwells with Vivasvat (IX, 26, 4)" -Mac. p. 42., as well as Āpah (vide Soma and Āpah). This description points to the stellar nature of this God. "The gods are also once spoken of as the offspring (Janimā) of Vivasvat (X, 63, 1)" -Mac. p. 42. This does point to the preeminence of this god, which, in the stellar regions belongs to the Pole star - to Dhruva. "He is the father of Manu the ancestor of the human race" - (Mac. p. 42). The characteristic connection of Dhruva with the gnomon seems to have been referred to. "The Āsvins who dwell with Vivasvat are besought to come to the offering (I, 46, 13)" -Mac. p. 42. The Āsvins who dwell with the Vivasvat refer to their proximity at the Vernal equinox and the connection of Soma points to his proximity at the Autumnal equinox. "Soma dwells with Vivasvat (IX, 26, 4) and is cleansed by the daughters (H.=longitudes) of Vivasvat (IX, 14, 5)" -Mac. p. 42. "The streams of Soma flow through the sieve having obtained (the blessing) of Vivasvat and producing the blessing (bhagam) of Dawn" (IX, 10, 5) Mac. p. 42, is quite natural.

(63) Sacrifices followed the measurement of Time from the gnomon (Śaṅku). We read that "Manu was the institutor of sacrifice.-For when he had kindled the fire, he presented the first offering with the seven priests to the gods" (X, 63, 7)-Mac. p. 139. The seven priests are the Saptarṣis heliacally arrived, associated with the sacrifices which start at the end of the rainy season in autumn and with the suppression of Hydra. Yama too is the son of Vivasvat (Mac. p. 139) which is the same conception but from a different view point-from point of oblivion with reference to short human standard

(64) Tvastr-Sarasvatī: We apply the calendar to ascertain the position of sun when the worship in honour of the goddess Sarasvatī commences. The days when this goddess is invoked are Āsvin, 7th to 9th tithis (digits), of the bright half, when the lunar mansion on its seventh tithi is Mūla constellation, and on the ninth the constellation is then Śravana. The first day of the Śravana month is of the dark half when the sun is in the 47th space of Puṣya and the moon is in the O (or first) space of the Abhijit constellation (Vide tables III-IV). From that day, 81

digits of the moon will complete the sixth tithi of the Āśvin month (its bright fortnight) which would mean in all 79 and 43/62 solar days from the summer solstice, or 796 and 58/62 spaces of the ecliptic. The sun would therefore be at the time in the Citrā constellation perhaps nearing the Citrā star longitude (A Virgo-Spica) completing its 38 spaces, the regent god being Tvaṣṭṛ. By that time, the moon will complete 2 circles and 3358 with 29/31 spaces (134 spaces = a solar day) from Abhijit, placing herself in the constellation Mūla according to the equal space system (vide table IV). Three digits more and she is in the Śravaṇa constellation, in its 53rd space. Now we can understand the description of Sarasvatī¹ and Tvaṣṭṛ with reference to Citrā (Spica) star.

(65) Sarasvatī is called " an ' iron ' fort " — (Mac. p. 86) perhaps from the blue colour of the star Spica. She is called a stream (' *Sindhu* ') surpassing all other water (bright light) in greatness. The term ' *Sindhu* ' is remarkable in its reference to the star of the magnitude of Citrā (Spica-Virgo). It seems that great stars are considered to be oceans of (water) light. She has " seven sisters and is sevenfold (VI 61, 10-12) " — (Mac. p. 86) which evidently seem to refer to the (heliacal arrival of seven stars of the Saptarṣi constellation. " The goddess comes to the sacrifice on the same chariot as the Fathers¹ and seats herself on the sacrificial grass (X, 17, 8-9) " — Mac. p. 86. The reference to the arrival of the *Pitṛa-fathers* is a reference to (the heliacal) arrival of the Saptarṣis, perhaps completed at the same time. Her appearance at the harvest season has been an international symbol—a stalk is given in the hand of the Virgo: the Vedic poets see in her the motherly element and sings that " Her unfailing breast (cf AB. IV, 1.) yields riches of every kind " (I, 164, 49) — Mac. p. 87, a beautiful picture of the splendid harvest. She is " a Vṛtra slayer (VI, 61, 3-7) " — Mac. p. 87; evidently, since her beneficent influence persists even when the Hydra has not yet terminated. The star Spica rises just after or along with the Hasta and Svāti and hence its description acquires much of the imagery that can be pictured from the proximity of the Hasta constellation. " She is particularly

¹ Her name ' *Śaradā* ' retains the association of Autumn. So too the swan, lotus, flowers etc., emphasise this season in her picture, the peacock reflects the Saptarṣi—the fathers (vide para 75 for this peacock).

(H. and naturally) associated with the Maruts " -Mac. p. 87 and 78). "The VS. even speak of Sarasvatī as the bride of the Aśvins" (Mac. p. 87) which seems to refer to the astrological seventh house to their position in east (lagna), with reference to Citrā.

(66) The god *Tvaṣṭr* has an individuality of his own. He holds an 'iron' axe in his hand (VIII, 29, 3) " Mac. p. 116. This seems to refer to the shape¹ of the Hasta (Corvus) constellation. He bears a bowl of wealth, a cup full of Soma (AV. 9, 4, 3-6) " Mac. p. 116. This picture brings in Svāti in which constellation, Soma is purified and drunk by the gods." "As a companion of the Angirases, he knows the regions of the gods (X. 70, 9) " Mac. p. 117. This refers to his rise with the Saptarṣi constellation. He is "yoking his two steeds" (Mac. p. 116) which seems to point to the two stars of Aśvinī constellation in the opposite direction." Tvaṣṭr is especially the guardian of Soma, which is called the 'mead of Tvaṣṭr' (I, 117, 22) -Mac. p. 116. This seems to refer to the simultaneous rising of the star Svāti and Citrā on the eastern horizon. Since the (Autumnal) equinox does not fall in the Citrā constellation in spite of its having such close association, but it has to give way in preference to Svāti, (which rises earlier). Indra is said to have a quarrel with Tvaṣṭr and to have stolen Soma from his house (Mac. pp. 116-117) which is near equator.

(67) It will be worth while to note that the months, days and the fortnights of festivals have to be scrutinized before we may apply the old calendar. We have to see if they are or are not modified or changed later on; and to see if the days are either solar ones, or civil ones, or if it is the digits that are stated by the day. Wherever lunar digits and lunar mansions are stated it looks that the solar days (of solar months) are not in question, rather the solar day and position of sun amongst stars is fixed *through them*; but we have to be careful in accepting the name of

¹ The imagery after this shape of an "axe" reappears later in a different form in our classical literature in the figure of *Paraśurāma* who holds an Axe. It is like *Gaṇeśa* and *Kārtikeya*, the advent of *Agastya*-star Canopus-, the symbolical elephantine head being substituted by the axe-like shape of the Hasta (Corvus) constellation. *Kārtikeya* gives another imagery after *Agastya*, the ride on peacock representing its heliacal arrival along with that of *Saptarṣi* (vide para 75).


the month in all such cases. It seems that the system of equal spaces is agreed upon in the Vedic calendar in some quarters, in preference to the one of unequal spaces. That however does not alter the *actual* position of the stars though it alters, at times, the *space value* ascribed to them, in terms of the constellation.

(68) Vṛtra:— This is preeminently the *Ahi* the serpent of the obstructive and of the 'evil' tendency (Mac. p. 152 and p. 158). "Hence he is without feet or hands (I, 32, 7; III, 30, 8)."—Mac. p. 158. There is little doubt that he has some connection with the rainy season. "He has thunder at his disposal (I, 80, 12) as well as lightning, mist and hail (I, 32, 13)." Mac. p. 158. It is Maruts that help Indra to overcome him and his form of a serpent leads us to take him to represent the gigantic but zigzag constellation Hydra which ends in Svāti (regent god being Vāyu) and which begins at Āśleṣā constellation, whose regent god is Surpa the Serpent.

(69) He is overpowered in the Sarat season and it was then the fortieth day, fortieth perhaps from sometime to the heliacal rise of star Canopus on the Indian horizon (Cf. II, 12, 3 and 11). Indra released *seven* 'Sindhus' to follow their course is also told herein. It seems to refer to the free course of Saptarṣi along with Bōotes (the cow) after their heliacal rise. The release of the cows by Indra is accordingly quite natural, it being then the Autumnal equinox. The term 'Sindhu' applied to Citra is also applied to the seven stars of the Saptarṣi constellation. (Cf. II, 12, 12). The serpentine god was, of course, a *shining* god. It seems that "the seven rivers that flow in the jaws of Varuṇa as into a surging abyss (VIII, 58, 12)"—(Mac. p. 25) refer to the Saptarṣi and the Pole Star.

(70) In the fight with this Hydra group, Indra gets help from many other gods of whom, we have yet to consider the Bṛhaspati, Agni and Viṣṇu. For this purpose, we shall have to look to an additional factor—to the *Agastya star* in the south, (the cardinal point opposite to the North¹) which sets heliacally before the begin-

¹ We read in Raghu. IV, 44 "अगस्त्यचारितामाशाम्.....". Mallinātha in his comments observes that "अगस्त्यो दक्षिणमाशामाभित्य नभसि स्थितः । वरुणस्यात्मजो योगी विन्ध्यवातादिमर्द्दतः । इति अक्षयपुराणे ॥". We find here the same idea of "the Son" and of the "Father in Heaven" put somewhat differently.



No. 6 Shows constellations from ग्रहसंज्ञा (in hours 6 to 14) with seasons गर्म and शरत्. Shows ग्रह=Hydra from solstice to equinox (with adjoining constellations from ग्रहसंज्ञा with its 100 + forts, the 100 'Kauravas', the Dragon, the Biblical Serpent, the Evil, the Ravana, the Satan, embodying Rahu to Ketu etc., etc., spreading from ग्रह to स्वर्ग).

Vedic Gods—by H. A. Shah.

ing of Hydra but which rises heliacally on the termination of the rainy season (Cf. Raghuvamśa IV, 21). It is then the time when Hasta-Corvus is heliacally setting. Further, since the constellation Hasta is in the south, the other stars of the two succeeding constellations Citrā and Svāti set in soon after it. Hence the star Canopus is conceived to rise with the heliacal appearance of equinoctial star Svāti. This phenomena also has a parallel in the north with reference to the heliacal rise of the Saptarśi constellation, because it marks approximately the same time. Hence, in the fight with Vṛtra, we come across a star, its star-picture and the conception of Light as against the darkness (of the period of the rainy season).

(71) Evil: A few remarks on the evil serpentine god will not be out of place. The conception of evil as of a gliding, crooked, serpentine form is international (as Dragon, Hydra, Satan etc.), but Hydra constellation has escaped the notice as well as the Northern star group of Saptarśi and the Southern star Agastya, the two saving graces to this evil, all of them have been lost sight of. At times the Draco constellation is mistakenly taken when the Hydra ought to figure in. The Biblical serpent who is tempting the Eve with the (golden?) fruit is this Hydra with the (golden) Svāti (Arcturus) at its end, the Eve being the Light associated with the gnomon (= Adam) [cf. quotation (K) from the Jain Text and notes thereon pp. 159-160.] The dagon in most of the myths is Hydra. The several headed monster in the story of Hercules is none else than the Hydra constellation, the mouths representing the stars that may be associated with the Āśleṣā constellation, Hercules representing Canopus-Agastya.

(72) Bṛhaspati: The planet Jupiter is out of question here. Bṛhaspati is the regent god of the Puṣya constellation at the summer solstice the cardinal northern point, and which is near the Hydra constellation. "He is seven mouthed and seven rayed" (IV, 50, 4-Mac. p. 101) which fact points to his connection with the Saptarśi constellation; the end of the Saptarśi furnishes another picture. "He also wields a golden hatchet (VII, 97, 7) and is armed with an iron axe, which Tvaṣṭr sharpens" (X, 53, 9,) "Mac. p. 101. The golden colour is an index of the Svāti star and the shape of axe to that of the Hasta star, the proximity of Citrā (of blue colour) bringing in the regent god

Ṭvastr: He is said to be 'blue-backed' which cannot be explained by reference to Citrā star; but "he is golden-coloured and ruddy (V. 43, 12)"—Mac. p. 101. This it seems, is a northern imagery of the star Agastya-Canopus, which, when it rises heliacally is accompanied with the heliacal arrival of the Saptarsi stars. The colour of Agastya is changing and variegated to-day but it was red if we follow the covert allusions to it¹ in the dramas of Kālidāsa (Vide writer's paper "Astronomical Data in the Dramas of Kālidāsa").

(73) The epithet Āṅgīrasa (son of Āṅgīrasas) belongs to him exclusively (II, 23, 18)—Mac. p. 102. This does emphasise his connection with the Saptarsi. So too, in the description—"When Brhaspati with fiery gleams rent the defences of Vala, he revealed the treasures of the cows; as if splitting open eggs, he drove out the cows of the mountain; he beheld the honey enclosed by the stone; he brought it out, having cloven (Vala) with his roar; he smote forth as it were the marrow of the Vala (X. 68, 4-9)"—Mac. p. 102. This description points to the end of Saptarsi constellation connected with the Bōōtes and the end of Hydra at the Autumnal equinox. The equinoctial place seems to have been called a mountain. It was on the mountain that the Ahi (= Vṛtra) was resting (Mac. p. 158). It was from the mountain that the bird (Svāti) brought the fire (Mac. p. 71). The top of the gnomon is as it were a peak (Sānu) as we saw in the case of Trita (vide Trita). *He drove out the cows and distributed them in heaven* (II, 24, 14.)—Mac. p. 102. The cows so released are therefore *not terrestrial*. It will be perhaps evident. With Indra, he is Soma drinker (IV, 49, 3; IV 50, 10)" (Mac. p. 103) which is an index of his proximity to the Autumnal equinox. He is naturally associated with the Maruts (Mac. p. 103) which transfers to him the roar of the Maruts in the fight. And since he is associated with the Saptarsis, he is associated with songs, with the wisdom of the priests as well as with their learning. Thus he is supreme in his beneficence because prosperity is the fruit at the Autumnal equinox. (vide Amara I 3, 24, 27 re. Āṅgīrasa.)

¹ The uniting red jewel in the Vikramorvaśīya and the red-jewelled ring of the Śākuntala. Cf. also Vikram. IV, 34, 36; V, 2, 3, 4 etc. for their descriptions of deep red color.

(74) Viṣṇu: In the conception of this god we have another imagery drawn around the star Agastya the regent of the South. He rises daily for some hours and then sets. But his treadings are marked by important events in human life. In Viṣṇu, he is conceived as taking big strides—three strides—of which the third is beyond the ken of mortals. “Man glorifying Viṣṇu, tracks two steps of that heaven beholding (deity) but he apprehends not the third; nor can the soaring winged birds (pursue it)” (—Wilson—) RV I. 155, 5 —Mac. p. 38.” The same notion seems to be mystically expressed (I, 155, 3) when he is said to bear his third name in the bright realm of heaven. The highest place of Viṣṇu is regarded as identical with the highest place of Agni, for Viṣṇu guards the highest, the third place of Agni (X, 1, 3) and Agni with the loftiest station of Viṣṇu guards the mysterious cows (V, 3, 3). The highest step of Viṣṇu is seen by the liberal like an eye fixed in heaven (I, 22, 20); it is his dear abode where pious men rejoice and where there is a well of honey (I, 154, 5), and where the gods rejoice (VIII, 29, 7). This highest step shines down brightly and is the dwelling of Indra and Viṣṇu, where are the many-horned swiftly moving cows [“यत्र गावः दुरिभृता अयासः,”] and which the singer desires to attain (I, 154, 6)”—Mac. p. 38.

(75) It is told that the *three* steps exhaust all the ‘Bhuvanas’ (I, 154, 2). This expression, we suggest, should be taken to mean that the three ‘strides’ cover all the changes in the year, of one complete revolution of sun whereafter the phenomena would repeat. Thus, we must measure the strides *along the ecliptic* in its 3660 spaces. The loftiest step is invisible and in the bright realm of heaven; therefore it represents the phenomena when the star Agastya has set heliacally. Since the final step contains ‘flow of honey’—which is a reference to the rains and their results; and ‘wherein there are many horned cows’ which is a reference to the Saptarṣis with their forecrest (known thereby at times as ‘Citrasikhaṇḍī’—a peacock with crest—Amara I, 3, 27); the final step must therefore be from the summer season to the autumn or to the Autumnal equinox. The third name may refer to Brhaspati but this is only a conjecture because we do not know the other names at present. Now, if we count the spaces onwards

on the ecliptic from Abhijit, 1220 spaces would bring us to the constellation Kṛttikā (Pleiades) according to the equal space division. From thence, further 1220 spaces would bring us to the end of the constellation Uttarāphālgunī the period of the invisibility of Agastya. The third 1220 spaces would take us back to Abhijit whose regent is Brahmā. The star Canopus sets heliacally just about the sun in Kṛttikā (vide table IV)¹ and rises when the sun is covering up Hasta in his rays. This is just the step—the final and the third (if the first begins with the heliacal rise of Agastya)—where he is not seen—it is really beyond the mortal ken, only ‘the wise’ or liberal know it. It is remarkable that the regent god of the constellation Kṛttikā is Agni. (This may perhaps account for the list of constellations starting with Kṛttikā found in some works). “Viṣṇu is spoken of (I, 156, 5) as having three abodes (Trisadhastha) an epithet primarily appropriate to Agni.” Mac. p. 38. Shall we be justified to say that one of the two unknown names of Viṣṇu is Agni? Viṣṇu is considered *the* ‘ancient germ of order’ (Mac. p. 38) which seems to signify some basis of the Agni worship, connected with the cycle of seasons and Canopus.

(76) The cows in the sacrifice ‘*Ṛṣām Agnā*’ seem to be of

¹ *The heliacal setting of Agastya-Canopus*:— This happens in or about the beginning of sign Taurus when the sun is there (vide tables III and IV for the signs) and which circumstance is graphically narrated in the Gospels as the ‘betrayal’ of Christ by one of his *twelve* disciples (in one of the twelve signs of the ecliptic) for 30 pieces of silver (which is 30 degrees or perhaps 30 days in a sign). The heliacal rise of this star occurs when the sun is in the sign Virgo (vide tables III and IV for the sign) which makes it symbolically the ‘son of a Virgin’ as the Gospels would have it. From Taurus to Virgo, it is the third portion of the ecliptic—the one vast stride of Viṣṇu. “The Son of Man will come in clouds” is a natural imagery arising out of association of Canopus with the rainy season (the idea seems to have originated in the conception of the “Apāṁnapāt god). The heliacal rise of this star is associated with harvest—the Christ is styled the “Lord of Harvest.”

When this truth will be realized, it will be found that for want of proper elucidation of such *symbolical* accounts, the “betrayal” of Christ has been ascribed to an individual or to a tribe or to a race; and develop therefrom one of the most unfortunate piece of history—develop bitterness leading to hatred, vengeance and persecution; and that they follow on and persist through centuries for the ‘blood’ of Christ—for the yearly phenomena of the heliacal setting of Canopus in reality !

Saptarṣis with their crest (=horns) in the forepart and hoofs in Bōotes, the cows which reside in the final step of Viṣṇu, when during rains, for two months, the sacrifices get out of question.

(77) In the fight against Vṛtra, naturally Viṣṇu is associated with Indra. "Indra about to slay Vṛtra says, 'Friend Viṣṇu, stride out *vastly*' (IV, 18, 11)" Mac. p. 39. The one important function of Agastya is suppression of Hydra, classically, of the King Bali.

(78) Indra: One of the central figures in the Vedic poetry is Indra. He nearly reflects the character of the most of gods we have described so far. We need not therefore repeat the descriptions. "All the gods are unable to frustrate his deeds and counsels (II, 32, 4) 'Even Varuṇa and Sūrya are subject to his command' (I, 101, 3 cp. II, 38, 9)" Mac. p. 58. This description would not warrant his identity with the sun. Varuṇa is the god of Night and hence, in day time, the god who would command Sun is Indra. It looks therefore that the Indra god is *the regent god* of the Sun (East) as Varuṇa god is the regent god of the Star Dhruva (North). He is a fighting god and the fight with Vṛtra (cf. Mac. pp. 58 61 and the Maps) puts him at the summer solstice point and also at the Autumnal equinox. "His car is drawn by the *two* tawny steeds (*harī*)" (Mac. p. 55). This description associates him with the Vernal Equinox, the two steeds seem to be the two Aśvin stars. His fondness for the drink of Soma associates him with Light and Time and since he is resplendant (in the sun) *he is drinking it much more than any other god*, the exception being made of the Vāyu god, the latter having the privilege of being stationary at the Autumnal equinox. This is sufficient to explain the Indra god over and above what has been explained in connection with the various other gods. cf. Note 'G' on p. 151.

(79) Agni:— After considering the several gods, we are in a position to understand the god Agni and Agni worship. The place of Agni is as central in the religious literature as it is in the home of the Vedic times. Agni is *the Light that is on the earth but, in a representative capacity*. He is "Purphita" (Mac. p. 96) "representative" on earth of the *heavenly* lights. When the star-lights are gone-invisible, when the sun is absent-not yet on the horizon-at Dawn, Agni the representative is lighted

up. He thus represents the star light that is not present. When in the evening, the (star) light again returns with the stars, his function of representation is superfluous—it terminates. It is not to be forgotten that the sun is not the predominant figure or an exclusive eminent god in the Vedic conceptions. Varuṇa has his own eminence. Of a subordinate nature is the eminence of Mitra. Of another eminence is the star Canopus-Agastya in various imageries of Vedic gods. Agni is therefore the representative of each and every one of them, at day time or when they are with the sun, set heliacally. Hence, till the time of the heliacal rise of this star Canopus, Agni represents him as *Apām-vatsa* or rather as *Apāmnāpāt*, as son of waters. “Waters”-because it is then the rainy season. (We may here recollect the imagery of the gospels that ‘the Son of Man will come on clouds’). Agni when born is Varuṇa ”—(Mac. p. 29) is a perfect expression since Varuṇa is not visible at day and because Varuṇa is the pivot of the (Vedic) stellar gods, the sun being only one of the many such gods. It is thus that the sacred and godly character of Agni is bestowed on it by Varuṇa. “When kindled, he is Mitra (V 31, 1)” (Mac. p. 29) is also true. It is in the measurement of time (from morn) that the Mitra god stands associated with the Varuṇa. Agni in waters (Mac. p. 92) is a reference to the Agastya, when he is in waters in the rainy season. The autumn follows. It is told that *Uṣas arrives with a bright child* (Mac p. 48) she has been produced (*prasūtā*) for the production (*savāya*) of Savitṛ and arrives with a bright child (I, 113, 1-2)”. Savitṛ is the regent god of Hasta (Corvus) constellation. (Cf. Gospels “Before they came together she was found with child of the Holy ghost” Matthew I, 18-19, and “Joseph knew her not till she had brought forth a son” — (I, 25). This is the case of the heliacal rise of star Agastya (in Autumn with Sun in Virgo) in the proximity of the Autumnal equinox through the early appearance of star Svāti where the equator and ecliptic unite. He is thus said “to have been born from the belly of Asura III 29, 4)” (Mac. p. 90) meaning thereby the heliacal rise of Agastya even while the (asura) Hydra was there. Thus the importance of the advent of Canopus is the importance of Agni. “In him are comprehended all the gods (V, 3, 1), whom

he surrounds as a felly the spokes (V, 13, 6) " (Mac. p. 95) is the correct description of Agni since the Vedic gods are stellar gods and the Vedic analysis of the prime force seems to be the Light that pervades everywhere in one form or another. Agni represents an unbroken human touch with the divine lights as their representative on the earth. 'Thus the sun enters Agni when it sets' (Mac. p. 93).¹

(80) As a representative of Light and of Time too, through the light, Agni is described as follows:— "Agni knows the sacrifice exactly (X, 110, 11) and knows all rites (X, 122, 2). Knowing the proper season he rectifies the mistakes which men commit through ignorance of the sacrificial ordinances of the gods (X, 2, 4-5)" Mac. p. 97. Thus he becomes a centre of knowledge, of prayers, of devotion, of offerings and of all the activities the knowledge may lead to. "The sacrificial fire seems to have been an Indo-European institution also, since the Italians and Greeks, as well as the Iranians and Indians had the custom of offering gifts to the gods in fire" Mac. p. 99.

(81) Great importance has been attached to the harvest season falling about the Autumnal equinox. *The bird*—or the star—Svāti thus fetching the fire, the Light, or kindling the fire has been an international story. The daughter of the sage Kapva protected by the *bird* (Svāti) earns a most graceful tribute Śakuntalā is the good action incarnate" ("शकुन्तला सृष्टि-मती च सक्रियाः" Śāk. V. 15). This is the true description of the resultant activities which started with the resumption of the worship of Light and Time-of Agni worship, pure in the basic conception at the Autumnal equinox period. It did *degenerate*

¹ Here we can explain the Indian custom of *Waving of Light* performed before the images of gods at twilight, both at Dawn and at Dusk. When the stars begin to fade and disappear at Dawn, the temple doors are opened and the first ceremony performed before the deity is to wave the Light before the image, which is the *representative* of the (stellar) deity. The concluding ceremony at Dusk is identical in nature: since the stars begin to shine, the temple doors are closed after the Waving of Light. It is called "Āratrika" ceremony implying its limitation to the time of night only. The human touch with gods—with the stellar gods remains uninterrupted after dusk to dawn, during night: but during day it is lost and accordingly, it is *continued* through the representative image, the representation with its resumption or its termination being carried through this symbolical act of "Waving of Light."

later on into bloody sacrifices when the stellar light value of the gods was lost in blood. Mac. pp. 29-30 :- "The same contrast between Mitra as god of day and Varuṇa as god of night is implied in the ritual literature, when it is prescribed that Mitra should receive a white and Varuṇa a dark victim at the sacrificial post (TS. II, 1, 7, 4; II, 1, 9, 1; MS. II, 5, 7) ". Stars were described at times as animals as it may be seen with reference to Viṣṇu who is described as "सृगो तु भीमः कुचयो-गिरिष्ठाः" I, 154, 2. It may be easily realised how 'sacrifices' came to mean 'killing the 'animal,' associated with gods or with godhood. The Goats are sacrificed to goddesses, the sign Aries (Rām) getting associated with the Vernal Equinox.

It is the stellar value that is preserved in the classical (stellar) figures of gods, in their images that were conceived therefrom, and which represent a step secondary to the Agni worship. The most prominent instance is that of the Gaṇeśa creation and his worship. (cf foot-notes, pp. 129-135).

(82) It has not been yet possible for the writer to understand the several other Vedic gods. Perhaps they may have some connection with the lunar mansions and with full moon.

(83) Before concluding this article, we quote that "Soma is described in the RV. as pressed three times in the day. Thus the R̥bhus are invited to the *evening* pressing, (IV, 33, 11 etc.), Indra to the *mid-day* pressing. (III, 32, 1-2; VIII 37, 1), which is his alone (IV, 36, 7), while the *morning* libation is his *first drink* (X, 112, 1) Mac. p. 107. The R̥bhus are of the Saptar̥ṣi group whose heliacal rise is described in the passage we quote just below. If the Āsvins terminate the divine night, the opposite point would be the termination of the divine day, and the summer solstice would be the mid-day. Thus Indra has mid-day pressing while R̥bhus (of the Saptar̥ṣi at the Autumnal equinox = the divine evening) have the evening pressing. And when Indra gets identified in the Sun, he gets the morning one too at the Vernal Equinox. Let us quote the condition described of the time when, at about Hasta constellation, (its regent god being Savitr̥) the Saptar̥ṣis rise heliacally and when Citrā, with its regent god Tvast̥r and the indication of

the Autumnal equinox Svāti (Vāyu) are manifest through early arrival of Svāti (Vāyu).

(84) " Another myth connects the Rbhus with Savitṛ. They are said to have been round the sky; wind-spṛd, in swift course (IV, 33, 1; Cp. I, 161, 12). After much wandering, they came to the house of Savitr, ¹ who conferred immortality on them when they came to Agohya (I, 110, 2-3). When slumbering for twelve days, they had rejoiced in the hospitality of Agohya, they made fair fields and directed the streams, plants occupied the arid ground and water the lowlands (IV, 33, 7). By their skill they made grass on the heights and waters in the depths, when they slumbered in the house of Agohya (I, 161, 11). Having slept, they asked Agohya as to who had awakened them; in a year they looked around (I, 161, 13)" Mac. p. 133. There will be nothing that will remain concealed once we recognise the heliacal rise of Agastya, when Hasta stars set heliacally, when Saptarsis rise heliacally, in the name ' Agohya ' and its (heliacal rise) period, before the Autumnal equinox, with the cessation of rain and with abundance of vegetation and harvest. The heliacal rise of the Saptarsis seems to be complete when Svāti sets heliacally—they are then 'wind-spṛd' resuming, after Svāti their revolutions, their daily course of rising, culmination and setting. Their heliacal rise in Autumn is beautifully and vividly described coupled as it is with the heliacal rise of Canopus in that interval (—it is the very same picture in the Gospels wherein, the Magi, the Wise Men from the East, come to worship the Child who is then born to the " Virgin—Mt. II, 1-12 "). The query —' who awakened them ?—' sounds mysteriously answered: in a year they get the answer when the heliacal rise is so repeated.

(85) The Rudras have not been referred to here but we may say in brief that they are the regents of Ārdṛā (Betelgeuse) and of Star Sirius (α-Canis Majoris), the latter occupies portion of hot season; rising in rainy season and the god thus partakes of two

¹ Cf. note on pp. 129-131 relating to the connection of Vasiṣṭha star and Canopus in the history and interpretation of the word ' Kumbhayoni. ' Savitṛ god is the regent god of the constellation Hasta (Corvus),—the note explains its bearing to ' Kumbha ', with which Citrā (Spica), Vasiṣṭha and Canopus stars are associated.

sorts of temperament both convenient and inconvenient, beneficent and malevolent.¹ Ārdra being in hot season and heliacal rise of Sirius occurring in rainy season amidst torrential rains. [In the paper "*Vedic Gods-V-Rudra-Kāli*" full consideration of Rudra is taken up along with the *Divine Female*, Vasu (s), of gods Pūṣan, Savitr, Hiranyagarbha and of Prajāpati with '*Ajā*' in their connection. It was read before the Mysore Oriental Conference in Dec. 1935. It will be published in the A. B. I. in course of time.]

(86) *Resumé*: In brief the results (in this article) are as under :

The Calendar :—

The year—Primarily of 366 solar days, according to Kauṭilya, and Jain Texts controlled and corrected by Malamāsa etc.

The Ecliptic—3660 spaces, 28 constellations : two systems of equal (non-Jain) and unequal (Jain) distribution of spaces.

The months—Ending in full moon according to Kālidāsa. Kauṭilya and Jain Texts.

¹ To-day star Sirius is blue in color but it seems to be changing color in olden times. "A learned discussion by Dr. T. J. J. See, moreover, enforces the belief that Sirius was absolutely red 1800 years ago. 'Astronomy and Astrophysics,' Vol. XI, p. 29." [from Clerk's "Popular History of Astronomy during the Nineteenth Century" (1902). p. 375, footnote.]

It is remarkable that Kālidāsa refers to Śiva as 'Nīla-Lohita' (Sāk. VII, 34) which, with reference to star Sirius, would be blue-red i. e. purple color.

We add one more quotation on this subject from the "Star Lore of all Ages" by W. T. Olcott (G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York), 5th edition 1929 pp. 102-3, from its chapter on Canis Major-Sirius :—

"The question whether Sirius has changed in color since early times has given rise to considerable controversy. Ptolemy called it fiery red, Seneca, claimed it was redder than Mars. Cicero also mentions its ruddy light and Tennyson wrote, 'The fiery Sirius alters hue and bickers into red and emerald.' Dr. See, the eminent astronomer of the present day, asserts that 1900 years ago, Sirius was red.....There is a reference in Festus to the effect that the Roman farmers sacrificed ruddy or fawn colored dogs to save the fruits on account of the Dog star, and Dr. See, says there is no reason why the Romans should sacrifice red dogs except that Sirius was red, and dogs of the same color must be offered up to the "Dog" in the sky. There can be no doubt that many of the ancients looked upon red stars as angry deities.'

In the above description, we get another picture of how accidents of associations with Light degenerate into bloody sacrifices. The true perspective of stellar values gets obscured and lost ; and thence arise consequent misdirected applications.

Equinoxes—In the midst of Āśvini and in Svāti constellations.

Solstices—In Pūṣya and in Abhijit constellations.

The Gods and Goddesses :—

Varuṇa—Regent god of Pole Star Dhruva.

Vivasvat— " " " " " "

Mitra— " " of Śaṅku the Gnomon. (the Samrāt Yantra)

Dawn, Uṣas—With reference to Gods—Equinoctial points and with reference to Calendar, Equinoctial points and daily phenomena.

Āśvins—Twins—the Regent gods of Āśvini at the Vernal equinox.

Vāyu, Marut, Mātariśvan—The regent gods of Svāti (Arcturus) at the Autumnal equinox.

Brhaspati—The regent god of Pūṣya at the summer solstice (an imagery of Saptarṣi after Agastya—Canopus.

Viṣṇu—Agastya (Canopus : A.—Argo Navis).

Vṛtra-Ahi-Hydra—The regent of the Serpent god of Āślesā.

Pitṛs—Fathers—Regents of Maghā. Saptarṣi.

Rbhus—of Saptarṣi group.

Sapta Sindhus—Seven stars of Saptarṣi.

Cows—Rays of star light (particularly at Autumnal equinox).

Soma—Regent god of Light and of Light combined with Time.

Āpaḥ—As divine-Light ; as terrestrial, transformed into water, juice.

Sarasvatī—Regent goddess of Citrā (Spica — A Virgo).

Tvaṣṭṛ—Regent god of Citrā (Spica) constellation.

Manu, Yama—Śaṅku the Gnomon.

Yima—Shadow or Light that alights on Śaṅku.

Indra—Regent god of sun.

Agni—Representative of Stars on earth and of Principal stellar gods.

Trita—Śaṅku the Gnomon with its two quadrants on its sides.

Apāmnāpāt—Agastya—Canopus during its heliacal rise and in the rainy season.

Apsarases—Lights—Shadows coming to Earth

Gandharvas—Star groups at the Autumnal equinox, such as of Böötes.

Cowstalls—Star lights particularly of some of Böötes stars at the Autumnal equinox in Svāti.

Aditi—The milky way—the Heavenly Ganges.—Via Lactea.

Kāmadhenu—Star group Böötes with Svāti.

Aṅgirases—Saptarṣi group (Ursæ Majoris).

Rudras—Sirius (A-Canis Majoris).

Aryaman—Star Vasiṣṭha. (of Saptarṣis)

Bhaga—One of the Saptarṣi star(x).

(87) For all purposes and information, " Vedic Mythology " of late Prof. Macdonell has been relied upon while, for facts from the Jain sacred texts, the text of Kālalokaprakāśa has been used.

The Texts used are :—

—referred to as

- (1) " Vedic Mythology "—by A. A. Macdonell (Trübner Strassburg 1897). " Mac. "
- (2) " Hymns from R̥̥veda "— P. Peterson (B. S. S. No. XXXVI). " R̥̥v. "
- (3) " Kautillyam Arthaśāstram " — Dr. R. Shama Śāstri (Mysore 1919 Sanskrit series No. 54) Text. Translation (Mysore 1923, 2nd edition). " Kautilya "
- (4) " Kālalokaprakāśa " — of Vinayavijayji (Shri Jaina Dharma Prasāraka Sabhā, Bhāvnagar-Kathiawad).
- (5) " The Arctic Home in the Vedas "—B G. Tilak. (Poona 1925) Ch. on the Night of the Gods. pp. 68-70.
- (6) " Bhāratīya Jyotiṣaśāstra " — S. B. Dixit. (2nd edition, 1931 Poona) pp. 34, 53, 54.
- (7) " Meghadūta "—of Kālidāsa— K. B. Pathak. 2nd edition 1916.
- (8) " Simplified Stellar Maps " — (Lat. N. 20°) J. C. Clancey (1922).

- (9) "Popular Guide to the Heavens" - Ball. (George Phillip Son Ltd. London (1910).
- (10) "Śakuntala" of Kālidāsa-(Nirṇayasāgar Press edition Bombay). " Śak. "
- (11) " Vikramorvaśīya "-of Kālidāsa-Edited by Kale. "Vikram."
- (12) " Raghuvamśa " -of Kālidāsa-(Nirṇayasāgar Press edition Bombay) " Raghu^o "
- (13) " (Sacred) Jain Texts " - 'Sūryaprajñapti' (Publishers : Āgamodaya Samiti (Bombay and Surat) 1919.
- (14) " " " ' Jyotiṣkarandaka ' (Publishers : Āgamodaya Samiti (Bombay and Surat) 1928.
- (15) Referred to as " Kaye " - " Astronomical Observatories of Jai Singh.-" by G. R. Kaye (1918) A. S. of I. New Imperial Series Vol. XL.
- (16) " " " " — " Hindu Astronomy " - by G. R. Kaye (1924) Memoir of the A. S. I.
- (17) " Indian Ephemeris " by Dr. S. K Pillai, Vol. X, Introduction. " Pillai. "
- (18) Reference to author's another article :—
" Astronomical Data in the Dramas of Kālidāsa. " (to be published in the A. B. I. later on.) It was submitted to the Madras Oriental Conference (Dec. 1924) ; its summary will be found in the " Summaries of Papers " published by the Conference.
- (19) " Amarakośa " - with com. of Maheśvara. VI ed. 1907, by Jhalakīkar Bombay Govt. Central Book Depot.
— Amara

Tables of Contents. (Reference is to Paras.)

I-Varuṇa-Mitra-Sūrya : 1-12.

Varuṇa 1-3, 7, 10, 14, 69.

Mitra 4-6, 8-9.

Sūrya 8.

' Devas ' 11, 14.

Non-Vedic Devas 12.

II-Old Calendar : 13-41.

Varuṇa 14.

Authorities 15.

Kālidāsa 15, 16.

Months-Pūrṇimānta 16.

Season-Year 16.

Kauṭilya 17-23.

Fixed Solstice points 18, 30.

Fixed Equinoctial points
19, 30.

Year and Malamāsa 20-22.

Old Calendar-Jain 23-33.

cf. Quotations A-M and

Notes thereon pp. 154-161.

- Year 24.
 28 Constellations 25, 27, 29, 32.
 Ecliptic 3660 spaces-26,
 27, 30.
 Year and Abhijit 28, 29.
 Seasons 31.
 Regent Gods 32.
 Calendar Tables 33-38 (pp.
 162-171).
 Old Calendar (vide tables
 33-38.)
 Equal space 37.
 Full Moons 39.
 Vedic Basis 40-41.
 III-From Vernal Equinox :-
 42-44.
 Uṣas-Aśvins 42-44, 53, 79.
 Divine Day and Night 42.
 IV-Upto Autumnal Equinox :-
 45-85.
 Autumnal equinox in India
 45.
 Grouping together of Gods
 46.
 Vāyu Svāti 47-49.
 Trita Soma 50-52.
 Soma 51, 53-56, 78 and p. 157.
 Madhu 53
 Amṛta 53, 56.
 Āpaḥ 54, 57, 58.
 Cows 54, 55, 60, 61, 73, 76. p.
 151.
 Apasarases 57.
 Gandharvas 57.
 Yama-Yami 57, 63
 Vivasvat 57, 60.
 Two Dogs 57.
 Agni 58, 79-81.
 Agastya-Canopus 58, 70, 72,
 74, 75, 84 and 85 (Vide
 Vṛtra).
 Aditi 59.
 Kāmadhenu 60. pp. 151-2.
 Aṅgirases 57, 73, 61.
 Manu 62, 63.
 Yama 63.
 Tvaṣṭṛ 64, 66
 Sarasvatī 64, 65.
 Festivals 38, 64, 67.
 " Sindhu " 65, 69.
 Pitr̥s-Fathers 65.
 Vṛtra-Hydra 68-70, 71, 73.
 SaptaSindhus 69.
 Evil 71.
 Br̥haspati 72-73.
 Viṣṇu 74-75, 77.
 Three Steps 75.
 " Gavām Ayana " 76.
 Indra 78.
 Other Vedic Gods 82.
 R̥bhus and Agohya 83-84.
 Savitr̥ 84, 85.
 Rudra 85.
 Resumé of this article 86.
 References 87.
 Appendix : pp. 151ff.
 Addenda pages 151-3.
 Aryaman (to para 60) pages
 151-3.
 Bhaga („ „ „) pages
 152-3.
 " Jain Texts " A-M with notes
 and observations, pages
 154-161.
 Re. Star Maps-pp. 165-168
 and para 38. (Greek letters
 on p. 161)
 4 Tables : pages 161-172.

APPENDIX

ARYAMAN and BHAGA :-(Addenda to para 60).

The *cow* of Vasistha leads us to the identity of god Aryaman who is "so destitute of individual characteristics that in the Naighantuka he is passed over in the list of Gods" (Mac. p. 45). However, in RV. I, 139. 7, we find that Aryaman has a milk giving cow¹ (Gh. p. 66-67) which fact points to the *connection of Aryaman to Vasistha* (Zeta Ursa Major). The relation of both to the Autumn is significant in this respect. " The kings Mitra, Varuna and Aryaman are said to have disposed (created) the Autumn, the month, day and night (Mac. p. 25), sacrifice and ṛks" VII, 66, 11 (Gh. p. 66). That is just the function of Vasisthas who " claim to have first awakened Uṣas with their hymns (VII, 80, 1) " Mac. p. 47. The course of sacrifice resumes with the help of Aryaman-Vasistha. The prominence at the Autumnal equinox does permit the grouping of this star with Mitra and Varuna. " Together with Aryaman, Mitra and Varuna are called sun-eyed (VII, 66, 10) " Mac. p. 23 which means that none of the three can be identified with sun. When the (Hindu) longitude of this star is 162°-12', it is in agreement with Longitude 167°-57' of constellation Uttarāphālguṇī (its regent being Aryaman) whose *yogatārā* is Beta Leo (Kaye p. 93, 106). Both appear on the eastern horizon nearly the same time and the heliacal rise comes in later constellations. These points support the identity of the god proposed herein although it will be seen that it is not the only ground for the same. The emphasis on the meaning of the word "Su" to produce used in connection with god Savitr (regent of the asterism Hasta-Corvus) has been noticed (Mac. p. 34). This word " occurs in connection with (creation of) Uṣas (VII, 77, 1) with Varuna (II, 28, 9), with the Ādityās (VIII, 18, 1) and with

¹ In respect to this addenda about Aryaman and Bhaga the writer had the benefit of consulting a new treatise " Studies on R̥gvedic Deities Astro-nomical and Meteorological " by Sjt. Ekendranath Ghosh (referred to as Gh. herein). It is published in the Journal and Proceedings, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, (New Series) Vol. XXVIII 1932, No. 1, published 5/9/33.

This treatise supplements in a way the data we get from the work of late Prof. MacDonell.

Mitra. Aryaman coupled with Savitr. This employment being so frequent, Yaska (Nir. X, 31) defines Savitr as 'Sarvasya prasa-vitā' - 'the stimulator of everything' -" Mac. p. 34. It is thus evident that the heliacal rise of god Aryaman has something to do with Savitr. Indeed, such an eminent group of gods, and the heliacal rise of Ursa Major and that of Agastya at harvest time might have furnished an occasion for that famous Sāvitrī hymn of the Veda (III, 62, 10) Mac. p. 33. Creation of Uṣas points in fact to the Autumnal equinox. "Soma has been compared with Aryaman and Mitra and Varuṇa" (Gh. p. 66).

Association of Aryaman (Zeta Ursa Major) with gods Mitra and Varuṇa may again be referred to. "Indra is, however in RV once coupled in the dual as an Āditya with Varuṇa as chief of Ādityas (VII, 85. 4)....when one god alone is mentioned as an Āditya, it is generally Varuṇa, their chief;....when two are mentioned, they are Varuṇa and Mitra, once Varuṇa and Indra;..... when three, Varuṇa, Mitra and Aryaman;...when five, this is only once the case, the same three together with Savitr and Bhaga." (Mac. p. 44). This association does locate both the Aryaman and Bhaga to the period of these gods all grouped together, to the Autumnal equinox. Who the god Bhaga is *canno* be so easily determined but we may take him to be some star near Vasiṣṭha, say the fifth of Saptarṣi-Epsilon Ursa Major-whose longitude is 154°-39,' when that of the Pūrvāphālgunī asterism, whose regent is Bhaga, is 157°-36' of its Yogatārā delta Leo (Kaye p. 98, 106). The asterism falls in the rainy season when the agriculture is in progress and *when th heliacal rise of Canopus is approaching* in the lower latitudes. It is *at that time* that "the god Bhaga is asked to deepen the ploughing" (III, 12, 4) Gh. p. 75. In such case and when its heliacal rise is near or about the equinox, associating Bhaga too with all the benefits of nature at harvest, the word 'bhaga' acquires superb connotation. "Dawn is Bhaga's sister (I, 123, 5), Bhaga's eye is adorned with rays (I, 136, 2) and hymns rise upto Viṣṇu as on Bhaga's path" (III, 54, 14) Mac. p. 45. The above description too puts the god near the Autumnal equinox since Viṣṇu's strides are associated with this

period also (vide *Viṣṇu*). Anyhow, close association of *Bhaga* with *Aryaman* is unmistakable to support the proposed identification.

The pair *Vasiṣṭha* and *Arunlhati* (*Zeta Ursa Major* and *Alcor*) has always been in India an emblem of matrimonial bliss and of purity in wedded life (their heliacal rise at about the equinox - union of ecliptic and equator - at a time when it is all rejoicings amidst good harvest and bright prospects in the new season does contribute to their glorification). " *Aryaman* has been praised for providing a new wife, once with *Bhaga* (X, 85, 23) and once with *Bhaga and Savitr* " (X, 85, 36) Gh. p. 66. Thus we cannot think of *Bhaga* without the gods *Aryaman* and *Savitr*. We may again revert to *Aryaman*.

" In *Atharvaveda*, *Aryaman* has been invoked for benefit in general, to prevent ill-luck in marriage ceremonies (XIV, i, 50; XIV, 2, 13), to provide a wife or husband (VI, 60, 1), to remove ill omens on the part of a woman (I, 18, 2) and in mantras for an easy delivery (I, 11, 1) " - Gh. p. 66-67. We may well refer all that to *Aryaman-Vasiṣṭha* and read the praises bestowed on the sage in *Raghu*° I 58-74- " देवीनां मातृषीणां च प्रतिहर्ता त्वमापदाह् " ।

" In *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* (II, 3, 5, 4) *Aryaman* has been called the sacrificial fire (*Yajña*) "... " In *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (V, 5, 1, 12) we are told that the path of *Aryaman* is placed above the high direction (regions) of *Bṛhaspati* " Gh. p. 67. The fire does refer to the Autumnal equinox and the path refers to the northern regions where *Saptarṣis* are. The description will be clear if the reader refers to sections relating to *Agni* and its cult, to *Soma*, *Bṛhaspati* and to appearance of stars at about the Autumnal equinox on the Indian horizon - to their daily rise as well as to their heliacal arrival.

Beyond these few notes about *Aryaman* and *Bhaga*, we are not yet in a position to say anything more definite.

JAIN TEXTS-QUOTATIONS with OBSERVATIONS.

From the "Kālalokaparakūṣa" : Ch. XXVIII -PP. 1-141

(A) The solar year of 366 days : -

"—एकस्मिन्नयने तस्मात्सन्वयशीतिशतं दिनाः ॥ 292

षट्षष्ट्याभ्याधिका चैवमहोरात्रशतत्रयी ।

सूर्यसंवत्सरे दृष्टा विशिष्टज्ञानदर्शनैः" ॥ 293 (p. 38).

(B) Yuga (cycle) of 5 solar years = 1830 solar days :--

"तथाहि-सूर्याब्दस्य षट्षष्टिरहोरात्रशतत्रयी ।

पञ्चघ्नाष्टादशशतार्द्धिशाः स्युर्युगवासराः ॥" 300 (p. 39).

(C) Yuga begins on the 1st day. (Morn) of dark half o.
Śrāvaṇa :--

"चान्द्रं वर्षं युगस्यादिस्तस्यादिर्मास इष्यते ।

मासादिरसितः पक्षस्तस्यादिर्दिवसो भवेत् ॥461॥ (p. 59).

यदाषाढपौर्णमासीरजन्याः समनन्तरं

प्रवर्तते युगस्यादिर्भरतैरवतारययोः ॥463॥ (p. 60).

तथोक्तं जंबूद्वीपप्रज्ञप्तिसूत्रे —Q.— 'किमाई णं भंते संवच्छरा, किमाइया अयणा, किमाइया उऊ, किमाइया मासा, किमाइया पखा, किमाइया अहो-
रत्ता, किमाइया मुहुत्ता, किमाइया करणा, किमाइया नखत्ता, ? '—A.—
'गोअमा ! चंदाइया संवच्छरा, दखिणाइया अयणा, पाउसाइया उऊ, सावणा-
इया मासा, बहुलाइया पखा, दिवसाइया अहोरत्ता, रुद्धाइया मुहुत्ता, बालवा-
इया करणा, अभियाइया नखत्ता पञ्चत्ता, समणाउसो' । (p. 60)

'श्रावणाऽसितपक्षस्य तिथेः प्रतिपदोऽपि च ।

बालवस्य करणस्य कक्षस्याभिजितस्तथा ॥ 467 ॥

प्रथमे समये प्रोक्तो युगारम्भश्चिदुत्तरैः ।

भरतैरावतमहाविदेहेषु समं जिनैः' ॥ 468 ॥ (p. 61).

"C" The answer to the disciple Gautama by Mahāvira makes it abundantly clear that the calendar consisted of elements which related to the beginning of the Yuga in the dark half of the month Śrāvaṇa, when the season was rainy (Prāṇṣṭ) and the solstice point was the southern course of the sun and that the moon was then in the Abhijit constellation.

There were deviations later on in the months of the seasons which too were incorporated by the later commentators along with the original but evidently failing to match the two. It will therefore be no surprise if the students find a bit of confusion in this respect in these texts, in respect of the seasons related to months.

(D) Ecliptic=28 constellations=3660 spaces [see also Sūrya-praśasti X, 22 62, and commentary on it :—

“ ...जातानि षट्त्रिंशच्छतानि षष्ठ्यधिकानि 3660 ”... (p. 177)]

“भरणीशतताराप्राश्लेषास्वातिमहेन्द्रमसू ।

एतान्यपार्द्धक्षेत्राणि नक्षत्राणि जगुर्जिनाः ॥ 315 ॥

पुनर्वसू विशाखा च रोहिणी चोत्तरात्रयं ।

सार्द्धक्षेत्राण्यमून्याहुर्नक्षत्राणि जिनेश्वराः ॥ 316 ॥

भानि पञ्चदशान्यानि तुल्यक्षेत्राण्यथाभिजित् ।

एभ्यो विसदृशं भागार्द्धिंशदाढ्यास्य षट्दशती ॥ 317 ॥

[630 : 15 = 42 of Abhijit. Multiple of 15 has been adopted to suit the lunar course with muhūrtas. Thus 1005 = 67 ; 3015 = 201 and 2010 = 134 when divided by 15, the total of all being 3660.]

अर्द्धक्षेत्राणां च भानां क्षेत्रविष्कम्भ ईरितः ।

अंशाः सहस्रं पञ्चाढ्यं प्रत्येकं तत्त्ववेदिभिः ॥ 318 ॥

सार्द्धक्षेत्राणां सहस्रास्रयः पञ्चदशाधिकाः ।

तुल्यक्षेत्राणां च भागा द्वे सहस्रे दशाधिके” ॥ 319 ॥ (pp. 40-41)

Moon covers 134 (of 3660) spaces in a solar day of 30 muhūrtas.

(E) Solar position on equinoctial points in one Yuga of 5 solar years :—

“पञ्चदशमुहूर्त्तात्मा रजनी दिवसोऽपि च ।

यत्र तुल्यानुभौ स्यातां स कालो विषुवं स्मृतं ॥ 574

तथोक्तमभिधानर्चितामणो—

“तुल्यनक्तदिने काले विषुवद् विषुवं च तत्” ।

“तच्च श्यामादिवसयोः पञ्चदशमुहूर्त्तयोः ।

प्रदोषकाले विज्ञेयं निश्चयापेक्षया बुधैः” ॥ 575 ॥

‘तत्प्रत्ययनमेकैकं ततस्तानि युगे दश ।

याम्यायनस्य पञ्चोजान्येषु स्युर्मासि कार्तिके ॥ 577 ॥

“ D ” The division of 3660 cannot but go along with 356 days of the year. In the same way, to complete 3660 spaces, 28 constellations are required and hence the constellation Abhijit cannot be left out in this scheme of the calendar.

समानि माधवे मासि पञ्च सौम्यायनस्य च" ॥578॥ (pp. 74 - 75)

"पञ्चापि विषुवन्त्यर्कः कुर्यात्सौम्यायनस्थितः ।

स्वातेर्नक्षत्रस्य भुक्त्वा त्रयोविंशतिमंशकान् ॥ 600 ॥

अंशाश्चात्र चतुर्विंशदधिकशतच्छिन्नरूपस्य ज्ञेयाः ।

पञ्चापि विषुवन्त्यर्कः कुर्यात्सौम्यायनस्थितः ।

एकोनसप्ततिं भागानश्विन्या अवगाह्य च ॥ 601 ॥

इति विषुवत्प्रकरणं" ॥ (pp. 77-78.)

(F) Solstice points in a Yuga (here expressed in Muhūrtas, 3 muhūrtas making one space, 30 muhūrtas making a solar day) :—

"आवृत्तीः श्रावणे पञ्चाप्यादित्यः कुरुते युगे ।

पुष्ययुक्तो बहिर्गच्छन् सर्वाभ्यन्तरमण्डलात् ॥ 568 ॥

अष्टादशमुहूर्त्तादयमहोरात्रचतुष्टयं ।

पुष्यस्य भुक्त्वाः सर्वा आवृत्तीः श्रावणे सृजेत् ॥ 569 ॥

[4 days + 18 muhūrtas = 46 spaces (of 3660 division) of Puṣya]

अभ्यन्तरं विशत् बाह्यमण्डलात् कुरुते राविः ।

पञ्चापि माघस्यावृत्तीरभिजित्प्रथमक्षणे " ॥ 570 ॥ (p. 74).

[It refers to the 0 space of Abhijit]

(G) PP. 75-6 (verses 579-591.) give *lunar position*, digits (other works give months too) on the 10 Viṣuvas (= equinoxes) of the Yuga. They are as under :—

I रो० — का० व० 3	II ध० — वै० व० 9
III स्वा० — का० व० 15	IV पु० — वै० शु० 3
V उ० भा० — का० शु० 12	VI अ० — वै० व० 3
VII म० — का० व० 9	VIII अश्विनी — वै० व० 15
IX उ० आ० — का० शु० 6	X उ० का० — वै० शु० 12

"G" The first equinox in the first year of the Yuga occurs when the moon is in Rohiṇī constellation on the (completion of the) Kārttika Vadi 3. Since one solar month consists of 31 complete digits, three solar months (to arrive at the equinox from the solstice point) would require 93 completed digits and hence from the Śrāvaṇa first of its dark fortnight, it will be three digits of Kārttika completed.

(Continued on the next page)

Add 3 circles and 1281 spaces to O Abhijit at Summer solstice =1st विषुव । Then add double of it i. e. 6 circles and 2562 spaces for each successive position therefrom.

(H) Solar days of various type of months :--

“साध्वर्षिश्चिदहोरात्रा मासमानं भवेद् रवेः ।

ऋतुमासः पुनर्भिश्चिदहोरात्रात्मकः स्फुटः ॥ 311 ॥

एकोनविंशता चाहोरात्रिमासाऽमृतयुतेः ।

द्विषष्टिजैरहोरात्रभागैर्द्विंशताधिकैः ॥ 312 ॥

नक्षत्रमासोऽहोरात्राः सप्तविंशतिरन्विताः ।

अहोरात्रलवैरेकविंशत्या सप्तषष्टिजेः ॥ 313 ॥

एकात्रिंशदहोरात्राश्चेकविंशं शतं लवाः ।

चतुर्विंशतिविच्छिन्नाहोरात्रस्याभिवर्द्धिते” ॥ 314 ॥ (p. 40)

Solar = $30\frac{1}{2}$; seasonal = 30; Luni-solar = $29\frac{3}{8}$; Synodical = $27\frac{2}{7}$; 1 month (of 13 month's luni-solar year compressed into 12 months) = $31\frac{1}{2}\frac{3}{4}$. 12 months = 1 year (p. 40).

(I) The Luni-solar year ($12 \times 29\frac{3}{8}$) is short by several days of a solar year ($30\frac{1}{2} \times 12$): hence by every $2\frac{1}{2}$ luni-solar year, a luni-solar month of $29\frac{3}{8}$ days is added :—

(continued from previous page)

According to the writer of this article, the third act, of the drama Vikramorvaśīya of Kālidāsa, is a description of such an Equinox with moon in Rohiṇī. See his article on the “Astronomical Data in the Dramas of Kālidāsa.” (to be published).

Can this be the three lakes that Indra drinks, the “lakes” being the digits of the moon? We read (Mac. p. 56). “For the slaughter of Vṛtra he drank three lakes of Soma—V, 29, 7; cp. VI, 17, 11.” That would further explain (Mac. ibid) “and he is even said to have drunk at a single draught thirty lakes of the beverage (VIII, 65, 4).” The thirty lakes would be the thirty digits of a luni-solar month, from one lunation to the other. We can therefore explain the passage—“So essential is Soma to Indra that his mother gave it to him or he drank it on the very day of his birth (III, 48, 23; III, 32, 9-10; VI, 40, 2; VII, 98, 6).”—Mac. p. 56—to mean that (at the commencement of Yuga) the solar year was converted into luni-solar on the first digit which means then the first drink of Indra on the start.

Then the Sautrāmaṇī ceremony is referred to [(X, 119)—Mac. p. 56] to cure Indra of the excessive indulgence in Soma drink. This excess must be then the excess of one or other in the daily value of the spaces of the sun or of the moon over the either. The ceremony goes on over three days which would perhaps point to the completion of three digits of Kārttika month when the Autumnal equinox is fixed up, when the “Jewel” is threaded—perhaps to the centre—when the “Sautrāmaṇī” is done.

“मासोऽधिकोऽयं स्यात्त्रिंशत्सूर्यमासव्यतिक्रमे ॥ 364 ॥

युगस्य मध्ये पौषोऽयमन्ते त्वाषाढ एव च ।

तृतीयपञ्चमे वर्षे तत एवाभिवर्धते” ॥ 365 ॥ (p. 47.)

This text ought to hold good for Kauṭilya II, 20, 38, last verse.

(J) P. 51 gives some of the lunar mansions on full-moon day :—

“नक्षत्राणि यथायोगं स्वस्वमासानुसारतः ।

भवन्ति यत्र राकायां कार्तिके कृत्तिका यथा ॥ 393 ॥ तथोक्तं-

‘जेष्ठो वच्चइ मूलेण सावणो धनिष्ठाहिं

अद्वासु अ मगसिरो सेसा नक्खत्तनामिया मासा’ ।” (p. 51).

Months bear their names from the constellation in which the moon is full e. g. का० शु० 15 then full moon in Kṛttikā and the month therefrom is styled Kārttika. Exception :—

ज्य० शु० 15 Full moon in Mūla constellation.

आ० शु० 15 „ „ in Dhanīṣṭhā „

मार्ग० शु० 15 „ „ in Ārdrā „

“ J ” The constellations of full-moon nights did form a *matter of observation as well as a matter of calculation*; hence any variance in the latter can be checked by the former. If the exact length of the year is not exactly 366 days but less by about-say- $\frac{3}{4}$ (or less) of a day it would mean that the sun will complete 3660 spaces in about $365\frac{1}{4}$ days, the daily course would then be slightly over 10 spaces. That cannot be checked daily, from course of Sun easily in a short time but the opposite point to the sun—the moon on a full-moon night can be checked. If the sun is faster, the moon has to reach more spaces than average 134 for a solar day to complete the full-moon point. Hence, according to unequal or equal spaces, on Mārgaśīrṣa full moon the moon covers ordinarily 1475 and 50/62 spaces but the sun being faster, the moon ought to cover about 8 spaces more every month from Srāvaṇa and thus would put herself to fullness in the constellation Ārdrā in Mārgaśīrṣa, in Pūṣya in Pauṣa, in Mūla in Jyēṣṭha and curiously, in Svāti in Caitra, which last fact is slightly not in consonance with the statement of the text that the full-moon constellations generally synchronise with the names of the months with the only *three* stated exceptions. It seems therefore that 134 rate is an average one, the actual being more or less varying at different periods of the year, or of the month.

The discussion has another bearing. It is on the stated 366 days of the year which, being too much, would necessarily give rise to the procedure of “ Mala Māsa ”—of dropping of a solar month of some days to harmonize the calendar (mere reckoning) with the true course of the sun. The reader should refer to the observations on it in the article.

(K) Śaṅku is styled "Puruṣa" hence "Pauruṣī" the shadow:—

“शङ्कुः पुरुषशब्देन स्याद्देहः पुरुषस्य वा ।

निष्पन्ना पुरुषात्तस्मात्पारुषीति सिद्ध्यति ॥ 992 ॥

(pp. 125-126).

“तथोक्तं नन्दीचूर्णौ—

1st "K" The quotation from the Genesis has *very great significance* in this connection. As observed in the text of the article, the conception of Manu, Yama, or of Adam—the "ancestor" of the human race is to be referred to the Gnomon, the Śaṅku of the type of Samrātyantra of the observatories of Jai Sinha. So conception of "woman," of the first Śakti as well is to be referred to the Light which alights on it and on its sides, the left side of the Śaṅku facing the Eastern direction, where sun rises daily. The mid-day Light —"Prabhā- (or Shadow) tends to merge itself into Śaṅku and thus identify with it and with the Pole-star Dhruva and with its regent god Varuṇa. The evening shadow leaves the Śaṅku and as it were, dissolves into the vast stellar expanse of the light at night.

This identity of the woman with Light may have any significance of the accidental or of the natural fact of coincidence. The recognition of the either fact is sure to unravel the basic conceptions which in their turn will explain the developments of various beliefs, laws, and notions handed down to us in popular, secular or sacred literature with reference to woman or to Śakti and sacrifices in her honour (cf. para 81, 85). They will set right any injustice that may have been done unconsciously to either the man or the woman from magnifying the functions of either the Śaṅku or of the Light that gets associated with it—for *sometime* only as "shadow". We need not here pursue the matter except to point to the extreme significance of the growth of conceptions, with resultant practices.

2nd "K" The identity of Puruṣa with the Śaṅku has another important aspect. The Śaṅku is inclined to the pole-star always, head suppliant to Pole-star (and in which case, the left side would give out shadow cast by the sun in morning) and as such—I suggest—gives rise to the idea of continued devotion of Man to the regent god of the Pole-Star Dhruva—to a conception of Bhakti cult to that supreme deity.

The points of equinoxes then enter into this cult with the regent gods of the constellations at the Vernal and the Autumnal equinox—in various ways—. The sage Nārada preaching Bhakti is none else than the Svāti-Arcurus-star whose description in the Vikramorvaśīya (V, 19) of Kālidāsa is perfect even in point of time—of the moment of the Autumnal equinox. This is with reference to the Śaṅku and Dhruva, vide article—"The Astronomical Data in the Dramas of Kālidāsa" (to be published)

There is another point of association. The Śaṅku is associated with the Sun for the day time and thus he is a friend and ally of Indra in various battles that he fights—through the measurement of Time, represented in Sanskrit dramas as the hero mounting the chariot of Indra.

(continued on next page)

‘पुरिसोत्ति संकू पुरिससरीरं वा

तत्र पुरिसाओ निष्कन्ना पोरिसी इति’ (p. 126).

of. Genesis II 3. “She shall be called ‘Woman’ because she was taken out of Man.”

(L) Shadow on the solstice days :—

“पौषे वितस्तिच्छायाऽथ यदि स्याद् द्वादशाङ्गुला

तदा दिनस्य पूर्वाह्णं मासे मासे ततः पुनः ॥ 1085 ॥

द्वयोर्द्वयोरङ्गुलयोर्हानिर्भाष्या ततः शुचौ ।

मध्याह्ने स्यान्न तच्छाया खलमेत्रीव मूलतः ॥ 1086 ॥ यद्वा-

पौषे दिनाह्णं द्वादशाङ्गुला षट्पादा हीयते ततः ।

एकेकोहिर्मासि मासि चाषाढे निष्ठिताखिला” ॥ 1087(p.p.136-7).

(M) Pp. 102/104, verses 801-818 give the digits (out of 360) that are omitted to adjust the civil luni-solar (354) days.

(continued from previous page)

Thus the “heroes” invariably bear the characteristics of the Śaṅku (where they are not of a stellar type) while the heroines are, the Light that alights and associates with it, in *all early myths or religious literature* or in classical literature based upon either of them.

3rd “K” *On Agastyā* :— The northern cardinal point is associated with the pole star whose regent god is Varuṇa. The eastern and western points are associated with Sun whose regent god is Indra. Thus the Śaṅku gets associated with all the cardinal points and their regent gods because the southern cardinal point is associated with Agastya who is (in old times) associated with the changes in seasons and with the Autumnal harvest. It is after rains in India.

Thus the calendar gets involved with considerations of lore that arise out of Varuṇa, Indra and out of Agastya. The first two of the three have been recognised as great gods. The last one is recognised also as a great god but connected with the northern god Varuṇa—as Viṣṇu in Vedic times and later on as an Avatāra, as Kṛṣṇa, and as Son of the Father in Heaven—as Christ—later on. It is not possible to dwell upon or to enlarge upon this aspect of religion in this paper but we may note that the revivification of earth at the Vernal equinox was associated with the Sun god ; and the similar phenomena later at the Autumnal equinox (= harvest) came to be associated with Canopus—Agastya, giving rise to their deification and worship.

“L” This measurement of time (by the shadow the sun casts on the gnomon) makes it, in itself, exclusively a solar measure and a brake or a check upon the luni-solar calendar when discrepancies accumulate. The constellations are not visible at day-time Hence its importance.

“युगस्यायप्रतिपदश्चतुःपर्वव्यतिक्रमे ।

लभतेऽवमरात्रत्वमेकषष्टितमा तिथिः ॥ 806 ॥

आश्विनप्रतिपत् कृष्णा सा ज्ञेयास्यां यतोऽविशत् ।

तिथिर्द्वितीया सर्वाशैरेकषष्टिलवात्मिका ॥ 807 ॥

ज्योतिष्करण्डके तु—‘तद्वयमि ओमरत्नं कायव्वं सत्तममि पक्कमि ।

वासहिममिम्हकाले चउच्चउमासे विधीयंते” ॥ 808 ॥ इत्युक्तं

(p. 102)

This Prakrit text refers to equation of civil counting (360) to luni-solar counting¹(354).

“एवं च-आश्विनो मार्गशीर्षश्च माघश्चैत्रस्तथा परः ।

ज्येष्ठस्ततः श्रावणश्च पुनरप्येत एव षट् ॥ 811 ॥

पुनरप्याश्विनो मार्गो द्वितीयः पौष एव च ।

युगायर्द्धे पञ्चदश मासाः सावमरात्रकाः ” ॥ 812 ॥ etc.

(pp. 102-4.)

This explains the text of Kautilya in II, 6, 24.

“वर्षहिमन्तग्रीष्माणं तृतीयसप्तमा दिवसोनाः पक्षाश्शेषाः पूर्णाः” ॥

THE GREEK ALPHABET

For the Star Maps and for Table - II

α Alpha	ι Iota	ρ Rho
β Beta	κ Kappa	σ Sigma
γ Gamma	λ Lambda	τ Tau
δ Delta	μ Mu	υ Upsilon
ε Epsilon	ν Nu	φ Phi
ζ Zeta	ξ Xi	χ Chi
η Eta	ο Omicron	ψ Psi
θ Theta	π Pi	ω Omega

Table I

Serial No.	Names of Constellations नक्षत्र		Spaces according to unequal space system (Jain)	(Non-Jain) acc. to Equal space system	Total of spaces completed. Unequal spaces (Jain)	Equal spaces (non-Jain) completed.	Regent God of each constellation (Jain and non-Jain)	
1	Abhijit	अभिजित	42	42	0 - 42	0 - 42	Brahma	ब्रह्मा
2	Sravana	श्रवण	134	134	42 - 176	42 - 176	Visnu	विष्णु
3	Dhanisthā (or Sravisthā)	धनिष्ठा (अविष्ठा)	134	134	176 - 310	176 - 310	Vasu	वसु
4	Satabhishā	शतभिषा	67	134	310 - 377	310 - 444	Varuna	वरुण
5	PūrvaBhadrapadā	पूर्वाभाद्रपदा	134	134	377 - 511	444 - 578	Ajaikapāda	अजेकपाद
6	UttarāBhadrapadā	उत्तराभाद्रपदा	201	134	511 - 712	578 - 712	AhirBudhnyā	आहिबुध्न्य
7	Revatī	रेवती	134	134	712 - 846	712 - 846	Pūṣan	पुष्य
8	Āśvinī	अश्विनी	134	134	846 - 980	846 - 980	Āśvins (2)	अश्विनौ
9	Bharani	भरणी	67	134	980 - 1047	980 - 1114	Yama	यम
10	Kṛtikā	कृत्तिका	134	134	1047 - 1181	1114 - 1248	Agni	अग्नि
11	Rohiṇī	रोहिणी	201	134	1181 - 1382	1248 - 1382	Prajāpati	प्रजापति
12	Mṛgaśīrṣa (or Mṛgaśiras)	मृगशीर्षि (मृगशिरस)	134	134	1382 - 1516	1382 - 1516	Soma	सोम
13	Ārdrā	आर्द्रा	67	134	1516 - 1583	1516 - 1650	Rudra	रुद्र
14	Punarvasu	पुनर्वसु	201	134	1583 - 1784	1650 - 1784	Aditi	अदिति
15	Puṣya	पुष्य	134	134	1784 - 1918	1784 - 1918	Bṛhaspati	बृहस्पति
16	Āśleṣa	अश्लेषा	67	134	1918 - 1985	1918 - 2052	Sarpa	सर्प
17	Māghā	मघा	134	134	1985 - 2119	2052 - 2186	Pitṛ	पितृ
18	PūrvaPhālgunī	पूर्वाफाल्गुनी	134	134	2119 - 2253	2186 - 2320	Bhaga	भग

Table 1 (Contd.)

Serial No.	Names of Constellations. नक्षत्र		Spaces according to unequal space system. (Jain)	(Non-Jain) acc. to Equal space system	Total of spaces completed. Unequal spaces (Jain)	Equal spaces (non-Jain) completed	Regent God of each constellation (Jain and non-Jain)
19	Uttarā Phālgunī	उत्तरफाल्गुनी	201	134	2253 - 2454	2320 - 2454	Aryamā
20	Hastā	हस्त	134	134	2454 - 2588	2454 - 2588	Savitṛ
21	Citrā	चित्रा	134	134	2588 - 2722	2588 - 2722	Tvaṣṭī
22	Svātī	स्वाति	67	134	2722 - 2789	2722 - 2856	Vāyu
23	Viśākhā (or Rādhā)	विशाखा (रधा)	201	134	2789 - 2990	2856 - 2990	Indrāgn
24	Anu Rādhā	अनुरधा	134	134	2990 - 3124	2990 - 3124	Mitra
25	Jyēṣṭhā	ज्येष्ठा	67	134	3124 - 3191	3124 - 3258	Indra
26	Mūla	मूल	134	134	3191 - 3325	3258 - 3392	Rākṣasa
27	Purvā Āśādhā	पूर्वाषाढा	134	134	3325 - 3459	3392 - 3526	Āpah
28	Uttarā Āśādhā	उत्तराषाढा	201	134	3459 - 3660	3526 - 3660	Viśve Devāḥ

[Then repeat Abhijit etc. etc.

Data— (A) Cycle (Yuga), of 5 solar years, of 1830 solar days, of 1860 Digits (= 1860 Tithis), of 60 solar months, of 62 luni-solar months (= lunations), of 67 synodical (lunar completed circles). Ecliptic divided into 3660 spaces and into 28 constellations.

(B) Solar year of 366 solar days, the sun completing the spaces 3660.
(Continued on next page)

Table I (contd.)

(C) Luni-solar year of $354\frac{1}{6}\frac{2}{2}$ days (solar), of 12 luni-solar months each of $29\frac{3}{8}\frac{2}{2}$ solar days or 30 digits. (Its 3rd and 5th year has $383\frac{4}{8}\frac{4}{2}$ days (solar) and 13 months.

(D) Solar day of 30 Muhūrtas.

(E) Starting point :-- The Yuga, the first solar year and the first luni-solar year begin early morning, on the first day of the solar and luni-solar month Śrāvaṇa in its dark fortnight, when the sun has completed 46 spaces of the constellation Puṣya, when the moon has completed 0 space of the constellation Abhijit, when the summer solstice begins and when the rainy season starts, the preceding fortnight being the light half of the month Āṣāḍha.

(F) Digit = Tithi is $\frac{61}{62}$ of a solar day, and the moon covers $131\frac{2}{3}\frac{6}{1}$ i. e. $\frac{(61 \times 67)}{(31)} =$ i. e. $\frac{(61 \times 134)}{62}$ spaces during one digit or one tithi, while the sun covers $95\frac{5}{8}\frac{2}{2}$ spaces in a tithi. In a luni-solar month, in 30 digits, moon will cover $3955\frac{1}{6}\frac{0}{2}$ spaces (or, 1 circle and $295\frac{1}{6}\frac{0}{2}$ spaces) and sun would cover $295\frac{1}{6}\frac{0}{2}$ spaces. Moon would return to its position-which means it will complete $27\frac{4}{8}\frac{2}{4}$ (solar) days when it would cover 3660 spaces in $27\frac{5}{6}\frac{1}{7}$ digits.

(G) Spaces :-- The sun covers 10 spaces each solar day ; the moon covers 134 spaces each solar day.

(H) Solstice points :-- Sun begins summer solstice in the 47th space of Puṣya, and the winter solstice in the 0 space of Abhijit.

(I) Equinoctial points :-- Sun is in the Autumnal equinox at the end of 23rd space of Svāti, and in the Vernal equinox at the end of 69th space of Āśvinī.

(J) The sun covers 915 spaces from a solstice point to an equinox point or from an equinox point to the next solstice point. These points repeat five times in a Yuga.

(K) The moon covers 3 circles (= 10980 spaces) and 1281 spaces (or 93 digits) from one solstice point to an equinoctial point. So too from that point to the next solstice point. She begins with 0 space of Abhijit at summer solstice at the commencement of the yuga. Her lunar stations at those four moments every year in a Yuga do not repeat but change necessarily.

(L) Malamāsa:-- An expurgated solar month of x days after some years as Kautilya informs us.

Table II For actual observations. See star maps.

(See Pillai and Kaye and other books of reference mentioned on pp. 148-49 also p. 161.)

Serial No. (names as per Table I)	Color of principal star	Probable no. of Stars.	Description as to shape.	Modern Astronomic equivalents.	Probable YogaTara or Principal Star.
1 अभिजित्	Bluish White	3	Horn or head of a cow.	Alpha, Beta, Gamma of Lyra	A-Lyra (Vega)
2 अश्लेष	White	3	Lake or Balan- ced suspender.	Alpha, Beta, Gamma of Aquila	A-Aquila (Altair)
3 धनिष्ठा		5 (4?)	Cage of a bird	Alpha, Gamma, Delta, Beta, Epsilon of Delphin	
4 शतभिषा		100 (?)	Circle (?)	Lambda Aquarius and-XXXX-?	Lambda Aquarius
5 पूर्वाभाद्रपदा		2	{ (Giant Square)	Alpha, Beta of Pegasus.	Alpha Pegasus (Markab)
6 उत्तराभाद्रपदा				Alpha of Andromeda & Gamma of Pegasus.	Alpha Andromeda (Alpherat)
7 रवती		32	Helm of a ship	51, 60, 62 Delta, Epsilon, Zeta, 88, Mu, 89 of Pisces, 35, 33, 26, 20, 13, 12 of Cet- us: also 44, 75, 77, 80, D of Pisces and 42, 43, 34, 39, 25, 10 etc. of Cetus.	Zeta? or Mu? Pisces
8 अश्विनी		3 or 2	Neck or the head of a horse	Alpha, Beta, Gamma of Aries.	

Table II (continued from the previous page.)

Serial No. (names as per Table I)	Color of principal star.	Probable no. of Stars.	Description as to shape.	Modern Astronomic equivalents.	Probable Yoga Tara or Principal Star.
9 मरणी 10 कृत्तिका	Diamond Stars	3 6 (?)	Measure Bowl Form of a (fold- ed) razor. (Like letter 'e')	35, 39, 41 of Aries. "Pleiades"	35 Aries. Eta Pleiades (Alcyone,
11 रोहिणी	Golden Yellow-red	5	A toy-cart (Like-"V")	Alpha, Theta, Gamma, Delta, Epsilon of Tauri.	A-Tauri (Aldebaran)
12 शुक्राक्षि		3	Head of a deer	Lambda, Phi 1, Phi 2, Orionis.	Lambda Orionis
13 आर्द्रा	Red	1	Drop of Blood	Alpha Orionis	A-Orionis (Betelgeuse)
14 पुनर्वसु		4 or 2	(Resembling (somewhat) a parallelogram).	Alpha, Beta of Gemini and Alpha, Beta of Canis Minoris	B-Geminorum (Pol- lux) or A-Canis Min- oris (Procyon)
15 पुष्य		3	An arrow.	Alpha, 54, Delta of Cancri	D-Cancri
16 आश्लेषा		5 (?? 10?)	Hood of a Serpent	Eta, Sigma, Delta, Epsil- on, Zeta, Omega & Theta of Hydra.	Epsilon Hydra
17 मघा	White	5	Rampart of a fortress (sickle)	Alpha, Eta, Gamma, Zeta, Mu, Epsilon of Leo.	A-Leo (Regulus)
18 पूर्वाफाल्गुनी		2	Like a	Theta, Delta, of Leo	D-Leonis
19 उत्तराफाल्गुनी		2	Bedstead	Beta, 93 of Leo.	B-Leonis
20 हस्त		5	Palm of hand with five finger- rs (or an axe)	Delta, Gamma, Epsilon, Alpha, Beta of Corvus.	Gamma Corvus

Table II (continued from the previous page.)

Serial No. (names as per Table I)	Color of principal star.	Probable no. of Stars.	Description as to shape.	Modern Astronomic equivalents.	Probable Yoga Tārā or Principal Star.
21 चित्रा	Bluishwhite	1	Fine Pearl	Alpha Virgo	A-Virgo (Spica)
22 स्वाति	Bright reddish (golden) Yellow	1	Coral like	Alpha Böotes	A-Böotes (Arcturus)
23 विशाखा		4 (2.)	A wreath	(Alpha, Beta, Gamma and Iota of Libra	
24 अश्लेषा		4	Streak of water	Upsilon, Beta, Delta, Pi, of Scorpii.	D-Scorpii
25 ज्येष्ठा	Like a flower of Coral tree	3	Earwear 'Kundala'	Sigma, Alpha. Tau of Scorpii	A-Scorpii (Antares)
26 मूल		11	Tail of a Lion	Epsilon, Mu-1-2, Zeta 1-2, Eta, Theta, Iota 1-2 Kap- pa, Lambda and Upsilon of Scorpii	Lambda Scorpii
27 पूर्वाषाढा		4 (2)	Like tusk of an Elephant	Gamma-2, Beta, Epsilon, D-Sagittarius Delta of Sagittarius	
28 उत्तराषाढा		4 (3)	"	Phi, Zeta, Tau, Sigma of Sagittarius	Phi of Sagittarius

Note :— Most of the description, colours and the number of stars are from the Jain texts which are at times supplemented from other observations. [See Käye-as also see Pillai (S. K.) " Indian Ephemeris " Vol. X (Introduction) ; - and personal observations. See maps] The Modern equivalents will show very nearly these constellations. The Yogatārā are taken from several sources. They are not in the Jain texts as such.

Table III

Data:—(A) The months here are solar months of $30\frac{1}{2}$ (civil) days

(B) Starting point of the first month is on the 1st day of yuga) of the dark fortnight, of Śrāvana, early morning.

(C) See table I, for other data, 10 spaces mean one solar day.

Solar Month	Constellations. unequal spaces which the sun covers in one so- lar month (Com- pleted spaces)	Total spaces	Season begins & con- tinues	Sign Stellar	Observations
I-Śrāvana श्रावण	पुष्य 88 आश्लेषा 67 मघा 134 पूर्वाफाल्गुनी 16 Total 305	305	Rainy वर्षा	Cancer.	Summer sol- stice begins
II-Bhādrapa- da (Proṣṭha Pada) भाद्रपद (or प्रोष्ठपद)	पूर्वाफाल्गुनी 118 उत्तराफाल्गुनी 187 Total 305	610	"	Leo	
III-Āsvin. (Āsvayujah). आश्विन (or आश्वयुजः)	उत्तराफाल्गुनी 14 हस्त 134 चित्रा 134 स्वाति 23 Total 305	915	Autumn. शरत्	Virgo.	Autumnal Equinox
IV-Kārttika कार्तिक	स्वाति 44 विशाखा 201 अनुराधा 60 Total 305	1220	"	Libra	
V-Mārga- śīrṣa मार्गशीर्ष	अनुराधा 74 ज्येष्ठा 67 मूल 134 पूर्वाषाढा 30 Total 305	1525	Mid- Winter हेमन्त	Scorpio.	

Table III (Contd.)

Solar Month	Constellations. unequal spaces which the sun covers in one so- lar month (Com- pleted spaces)	Total spaces	Season begins & con- tinues	Sign Stellar	Observations
VI-Pausa पौष	पूर्वाषाढा 104 उत्तराषाढा 201 Total 305	1830	Mid- Winter हेमन्त	Sagitt- arius.	Winter Solstice Begins
VII-Magha माघ	अभिजित् 42 भरणी 134 धनिष्ठा 129 Total 305	2135	Winter. शिशिर	Capric- orn	
VIII-Phalg- una फाल्गुण	धनिष्ठा 5 शतभिषा 67 पूर्वाभाद्रपदा 134 उत्तराभाद्रपदा 99 Total 305	2440	"	Aqua- rius	
IX-Caitra चैत्र	उत्तराभाद्रपदा 102 रेवती 134 अश्विनी 69 Total 305	2745	Vernal वसन्त	Pisces	Vernal Equinox
X-Vaisākha वैशाख	अश्विनी 65 भरणी 67 कृत्तिका 134 रोहिणी 39 Total 305	3050	"	Aries	
XI-Jyestha (Jyesthā- Mūliya) ज्येष्ठ (or ज्येष्ठाबुलीय)	रोहिणी 162 ज्येष्ठा 134 आर्द्रा 9 Total 305	3355	Hot ग्रीष्म	Taurus	
XII Āṣāḍha आषाढ	आर्द्रा 58 पुनर्वसु 201 पुष्य 46 Total 305	3660	"	Gemini.	The summer Solstice begins
Then I आषाढ etc.			Then Rainy etc.	Then Cancer etc.	

Table IV Data as of Table III.

Solar month	Non-Jain system constellation: completed spaces which the sun covers in a solar month. Equal space system.	Total spaces.	Season begins & continues.	Sign Stellar.	Observations
I-Śrāvaṇa श्रावण	पुष्य 88 आश्लेषा 134 मघा 8 Total 305	305	Rainy वर्षा	Cancer	Summer sol- stice begins.
II-Bhādra Pada भाद्रपद (or पौषपद)	मघा 51 पूर्वाफाल्गुणी 134 उत्तराफाल्गुणी 120 Total 305	610	"	Leo	
III-Āśvin. (Āsvayujah) आश्विन (or आश्वयुजः)	उत्तराफाल्गुणी 14 हस्त 134 चित्रा 134 स्वाति 23 Total 305	915	Autumn शरत	Virgo.	Autumnal equinox
IV-Kārttika. कार्तिक	स्वाति 111 विशाखा 134 अनुराधा 60 Total 305	1220	"	Libra.	
V-Mārgaśi- rsa. मार्गशीर्ष	अनुराधा 74 ज्येष्ठा 134 शूल 97 Total 305	1525	Mid- हेमन्त Winter	Scorpio	
VI-Pauṣa पौष	शूल 37 पूर्वाषाढा 134 उत्तराषाढा 134 Total 305	1830	"	Sagit- tarius	Winter Solstice Begins

Table IV (Contd.)

Solar month	Non-Jain system Constel. ations Completed spaces which the sun covers in a solar month. Equal space system	Total spaces	Season begins & continues	Sign Stellar	Observations
VII-Māgha माघ	अभिजित् 42 श्रवण 134 धनिष्ठा 129 Total 305	2135	Winter शिशिर	Capricorn	
VIII-Phālguna. फाल्गुण	धनिष्ठा 5 शतभिषा 134 पूर्वाभाद्रपदा 134 उत्तराभाद्रपदा 32 Total 305	2440	"	Aquarius	
IX-Caitra. चैत्र	उत्तराभाद्रपदा 102 रेवती 134 अश्विनी 69 Total 305	2745	Vernal वसन्त	Pisces.	
X-Vaiśākha. वैशाख	अश्विनी 65 भरणी 134 कृत्तिका 106 Total 305	3050	"	Aries.	Vernal Equinox
XI-Jyestha (Jyesthā-Mūliya) ज्येष्ठ (or ज्येष्ठाशुलीय)	कृत्तिका 28 रोहिणी 134 मृगशीर्ष 134 आर्द्रा 9 Total 305	3355	Hot ग्रीष्म	Taurus	
XII-Āśāḍha आषाढ	आर्द्रा 125 पुनर्वसु 134 पुष्य 46 Total 305	3660	"	Gemini	
I Then श्रावण etc.			Then वर्षा etc.	Then Cancer etc.	The Summer Solstice begins

ERRATA : STAR MAPS :

Following errors which have crept in the star maps (in transcription for making blocks) need correction by the reader before the maps are used.

Map No.	Site-hours	Errors	Corrections	Correct as in map No.
1		सूर्य	सूर्य	
		{ Canopus	Canopus	4
		{ अगस्त्य	*अगस्त्य	
			s.	
2		सूर्य	सूर्य	
		सम्राटयन्त्र	सम्राटयन्त्र	
		Polar Star	Pole Star	3
		अगस्त्य Canopus	अगस्त्य* Canopus	4
3		Eclipfic	Ecliptic	
		वासिष्ठ	वासिष्ठ	4
		सप्तर्षि	सप्तर्षि	
		Najor	Major	
		Mijar	Mizar	
		Corvnus	Corvus	6
		Boofes	Böötes	7
		वायु	(वायु)	
		Arcturus	Arcturus*	7
4	Above दानवगण		हस्त	Put as in 3, to the
	the 5 stars			five stars (above
				दानवगण)
		Ecliphic	Ecliptic	
		Boofes	Böötes	7
		मरीची	मरीचि	3
		Atumnal	Autumnal	3
5	XXIV	अहिर्बुध्न्य	[अहिर्बुध्न्य]	8
	III Put Divine Day दिवस			

Map. No. Site-hours Errors Corrections Correct as in map No.

6	VIII	Jeminorum	Geminorum	
	"	सर्प	(सर्प)	3
	"	आदिती	आदिति	3
	X	मघा	मघा	
	XIII/XIV	(वृश्च)	(वृश्च)	3
	" "	Bootes	Boötes	7
7	XII	Corvis	Corvus	6
	XVII/XVIII-Put λ before		*v in milky way, in tail of Scorpio.	
	XIX	आषः	[आषः]	
	"	अभिजित्	अभिजित् [ब्रह्मा]	
	XX	विष्णु	[विष्णु]	
	XX/XXI Put * ϵ Delphin as in Map No. 8.			
8	XIX	*k Vega	*k	
	"	*Lyra	*Lyra Vega	7
	XX	Put a third * γ to 'अवण' in Milky way		
	I	Andrameda	Andromeda	5
	II	*अश्विनी	*अश्विनी	5

STAR MAPS

The 8 star maps (with corrections of errors on pp. 173-4) will be found as follows : Nos. 1-4 p. 133, No. 5-p. 112, No. 6-p. 136, No. 7-p. 126 and No. 8-p. 144. For the Greek alphabet see p. 161.

These maps will help students of Vedic literature and of all other Indian and non-Indian religious or semi religious literature to visualise the heaven with reference to various hymns and gods. They will bring out vividly the associations of seasons with (stellar) asterisms and their regent gods ; their associations with seasons such as the Vernal and Autumn, with the Vernal equinox (maps nos. 8, 5), the Autumnal equinox (maps nos. 6, 7, 3, 4) and the Summer solstice (maps nos. 1, 2, 4, 6) ; their associations with the happenings in nature and in human life, with several phenomena of rainy season (map no. 6) and with the harvest (map no. 7), the sacrifices and other regulated activities of Autumn (maps. nos. 7, 6,). The old conceptions will be better understood with these associations.

Maps nos. 5-8 give the 28 Indian Zodiacal constellations and several other stars and star groups. Maps 3-4 give the Saptarṣis, no. 6 the Hydra; map no. 3 the Pole Star, nos. 4-6 star Sirius, the Dog, and nos. 4-5 the star Agastya-Canopus-Argo Navis. The regent Gods are stated in brackets [] along with the asterisms.

The Hydra, the Vṛtra-Ahi-the international Dragon, the Biblical serpent, the Dānava, the Rākṣasa and the Evil genius in various names and under various imageries in all lores will be seen (map no. 6) with the Vedic 100 " forts " -the Hundred " brothers " of the Mahābhārata and as the Rāvṇa of the Rāmāyaṇa, spreading itself from the Summer Solstice to the Autumnal equinox, from the asterism Āśleṣā (embracing the Equator) the classical Rāhu, to its terminator the Svāti-with the grouping of Hasta and Citrā asterisms in this connection-and Saptarṣi (map No 3) with Canopus (maps nos. 4, 5). The last one is one of the mighty

forces which suppress this Evil and it is variously represented as Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa, as Kārttikeya and Gaṇeśa, as Hercules, to name a few of the Divinities and heroes figuring out of the grace of this star Canopus-Agastya.

The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute is to be congratulated for extending to the readers the facility of these maps. Without such materials at the disposal of the public, the remarks of Alberuni (para 38) would still persist,—The maps do admit of greater precision, refinement, improvements, coloring of some stars and various arrangements to help students for their astronomical studies. They have yet to be supplemented by authentic maps of the latitudes of Ujjain and Kāshmir to show the position of heaven at the daily and at the heliacal rising and setting of several stars and star groups. For the present we have to fall back upon individual observations with all their shortcomings.

To convert the stellar value or better, the Light value into the Time value for human cravings and purposes, the Śaṅku—the Gnomon has to be looked to. Maps Nos. 1-2 will show it. For better illustrations see Kaye. More of this will be found in the “Vedic Gods: -V-Rudra|Kālī” in the coming number(s) of the *Annals*. Rudra as Śaṅku (and Sirius) with the “Kālī” as the Light in its most prime *and* modern form is pointed out therein. The laws of Manu and of Moses and of Yājñavalkya have grown around this Śaṅku, evolved out of continuity of thoughts and practices around this central figure.

KAVIDARPAṆAM

[A Prakṛta Treatise on Metres ,

BY

PROF. H. D. VELANKAR, M. A.

पञ्चमोद्देशः ।

अथोभयच्छन्दः ।

विसमे छकला समे वसू । वेयालीयं रोलगा तओ ।

अट्टसु छलहू निरन्तरा । वुसुवि कला न समा पराणुगा ॥ १ ॥

[विषमे षट्कलाः समे वसवः । वेतालीयं रो लगी ततः ।

अट्टसु षट् लघवो निरन्तरा । द्वयोरपि कला न समाः परानुगाः ॥ १ ॥

विषमयोः पादयोः षण्मात्राः समयोरष्टौ इति मात्राच्छन्दोऽंशः
ततो द्वयोरपि रगणो लघुर्गुरुरिति वर्णच्छन्दोऽंशः । इदं वेतालीयम् । अत्रापवादः ।
समाङ्घ्रिकलास्त्रष्टसु षट् लघवः संतता न स्युर्नच द्वयोरपि समो लघुः परेण लघुन
सह गुरुर्न कार्य इत्यर्थः । अत्रौजाङ्घ्रिषट्कलानां प्रस्तारे त्रयोदश भेदास्तेष्टावि-
हासका ग्राह्या यथा । स्थापना । ॥ साकास्तु पञ्च यथा । स्थापना । ॥ पराश्रि-
तसमकलाविकल्पाः साका इतरेत्वसाका इति पूज्याम्नायः । युक्पादाष्टमात्राणां
प्रस्तारे चतुर्दशभेदास्तेष्वसाका षोडश । षोडशभ्योपि संततषट्कलघवस्योपनी-
यन्ते । ततो जातास्त्रयोदश । तत्र ग्राह्याः । स्थापना । साकास्त्वष्टादश । तं त्याज्याः
स्थापना ।

तं चिय रगणंतसंठिए ये । तमुवच्छंदसयं वयंति वुद्धा ॥ २ ॥

[तदेव रगणान्तसंस्थिते ये । तद् औपच्छन्दसिकं वदन्ति वृद्धाः ॥ २ ॥]

तदेव वेतालीयमोजयां षट्भ्यो युजोरष्टभ्यः कलाभ्यः परस्य रगण
व्याप्ते संस्थिते यगणे औपच्छन्दसिकं वृद्धा वदन्ति ॥ २ ॥

आपातलिया भगणेण । गुरुजुयलेण य अंतगएणं ॥ ३ ॥

[आपातलिका भगणेन । गुरुयुगलेन चान्तगतेन ॥ ३ ॥]

वैतालीयमेवाङ्घ्रिप्रद्वये षट्शकलाभ्यो भगणेन गुरुभ्यां चापातालिका ॥ ३ ॥

समपायकलातिर्गन्तिमो । जह् गुरू उता होइ पश्चिमा ॥ ४ ॥

[समपादकलात्रिकान्तगो । यदि गुरुः पुनर्भवति प्राच्यिका ॥ ४ ॥

समपादाष्टमात्रासु तिसृणां कलानामन्तगतो गुरुः पुनश्चेद्विषमयोस्तु प्राग्वच्चेत्तस्यात् प्राच्यवृत्तिर्भीमादिवत् प्राच्यिका । सा त्रिधा वैतालीयप्राच्यिका आपञ्चन्दसप्राच्यिक आपातलिकाप्राच्यिका ॥ ४ ॥

उद्दिचिया सा पवुच्चए । जहि समेसु मुहलपरो गुरू ॥ ५ ॥

[उद्दिच्यिका सा प्रोच्यते । यत्र समयोः मुखलपरो गुरूः ॥ ५ ॥]

यत्रौजाङ्घ्रिकलास्वायाल्लघोः परो गुरुः सा प्रोच्यते उद्दिच्यवृत्तिः । प्रादुदीच्यिका । एषा प्राग्वत्त्रिविधा ॥ ५ ॥

तहा पुण्ह पायसंकरो । पुव्वछंदयाणं पवट्टयं ॥ ६ ॥

[तथा द्वयोः पादसंकरः । पूर्वच्छन्दसां प्रवृत्तकम् ॥ ६ ॥

तथा द्वयोः पूर्वच्छन्दसोः प्राच्यकोद्दिच्यिकयोरङ्घ्रिसंकरः प्रवृत्तकं युजो-र्मात्रात्रयाद्गुरुयुजोस्त्वायाल्लघोर्गुरुरित्यर्थः । इदमपि प्राग्वत्त्रिविधा ॥ ६ ॥

सव्वजुम्मपयजावरंतिया ॥ ७ ॥

[सर्वयुग्मपादजा अपरान्तिका ॥ ७ ॥

सर्वेषां वैतालीयोपञ्चन्दसकापातालिकाप्राच्यिकाछन्दसां समपादैर्जनितः अपरान्तिका ॥ ७ ॥

अजुग्मजा चारुहासिणी ॥ ८ ॥

[अयुग्मजा चारुहासिनी ॥ ८ ॥]

वैतालीयोपञ्चन्दसापातालिकातदुद्दिच्यिकानां विषमाङ्घ्रिप्रजा चारुहासिनी ॥ ८ ॥

असेसपायाइलपरो । गुरू जहिं सा दाहिणंतिया ॥ ९ ॥

[अशेषणादादिलान्तरः । गुरुर्यत्र सा दक्षिणान्तिका ॥ ९ ॥]

अशेषानां वैतालीयादीनां यथासंभवं सर्वेष्वङ्घ्रिप्रजायाल्लघोः परो गुरुर्यत्र सा दक्षिणान्तिका ॥ ९ ॥ उभयछन्दःप्रकरणम् ॥

जं विसमक्खरचरणं ऊणाहियचरणयं व रूवयं ॥

तिविहे छंदमि इमंमि जयदेवाइहि ण भाणियं ।

तं सव्वंपि नेयं गाहाणामं वियट्ठेहिं ॥ १० ॥

[यद्विषमाक्षरचरणं ऊनाधिकचरणं वा रूपकम् ।

त्रिविधे छन्दसि अस्मिन्नयदेवादिभिर्न भाणितम् ।
तत्सर्वमपिज्ञेयं गाथानाम विदग्धैः ॥ १० ॥

यद्विषमाक्षराङ्गिष्वन्यूनाधिकाङ्गिष्वकं वा रूपकं मात्रावर्णोभयरूपे त्रिविधे
छन्दस्यस्मिन्नयदेवाद्यैर्नोक्तं तत्सर्वमपि गाथाख्यं विदग्धैर्ज्ञेयम् ॥ १० ॥

छन्दसां वर्णगुरुलघुसंख्यानयनकरणमाह—

गुरुवर्जिताहिं अक्षरसंख्या वर्णगुणितयाहिं गुरुसंख्या ।
द्विगुणितगुरुहियाहिं लघुसंख्या रूपकलाहिं ॥ ११ ॥

[गुरुवर्जिताभिरक्षरसंख्या वर्णोऽङ्गिताभिर्गुरुसंख्या ।
द्विगुणितगुरुहिताभिर्लघुसंख्या रूपककलाभिः ॥ ११ ॥]

रूपकस्य यस्य कस्यापि छन्दसः कलाः संख्यायन्ते ततस्ताभ्यस्तस्यैव रूप-
कस्य गुरुवः पात्यन्ते चेद्वर्णसंख्या । वर्णाश्चेदुज्जयन्ते गुरुसंख्या । द्विगुणीकृता गुरुवो-
पनीयन्ते चेल्लघुसंख्या स्यात् । यथास्यामेव गाथायां सप्तपञ्चाशन्मात्राभ्यः
सप्तदशगुरुव्यपगमे चत्वारिंशद्वर्णाः । वर्णात्यये सप्तदश गुरुवः । द्विगुणैर्गुरुभिश्चतु-
विंशत्संख्यैः पातितैश्चयोर्विंशतिर्लघव इति ।

इति कविदर्पणवृत्तौ पञ्चमोद्देशः ॥

षष्ठोद्देशः ।

अह पत्थारो नट्टं उद्दिष्टं पगमाइलगकिरिया ।
संख्या तद्वद्भजोगो छंदांमि छ पञ्चया पप ॥ १ ॥

[अथ प्रस्तारो नष्टमुद्दिष्टमेकादिलगक्रिया ।
संख्या तथाध्वयोगो छन्दसि षट् प्रत्यया पते ॥ १ ॥]

अथानन्तरं प्रतीयते (इति) प्रस्तारो जातिवृत्तयोर्विस्तरान्न्यासः । नष्टस्य
प्रस्तारभेदेभ्योऽदृष्टस्य जातिवृत्तभेदस्यानयनं नष्टम् । उद्दिष्टस्य कति भो भेदाः
प्रस्तारोऽत्रिति प्रश्नेनोपन्यस्तस्य जातिवृत्तभेदस्याख्यानमुद्दिष्टम् । सर्वलघूनां सर्व-
रूपामेकादिलघूनामेकादिगुरूणां च जातिवृत्तप्रस्तारभेदानां ज्ञानाय करणमेका-
दिलघुगुरुक्रिया । जातिवृत्तप्रस्तारे भेदप्रमाणानयनं संख्या । जातिवृत्तप्रस्तारभूमि-
मानमध्वयोगः । छन्दसि षट् प्रत्ययाः प्रतीतिजननादेते स्युः ॥ १ ॥

तत्र जातिप्रस्तारमाह—

विसमाओ लहुयाई समा गुरू ठवहु उडुअहे य लहु ।
उबारिव पुरो पञ्छा पुव्वांवि हु जाइपत्थारो ॥ २ ॥

[विषमा लघ्वादीः समाः गुरून् स्थापय * * च लघुम् ।

उपरीव पुरः पश्चात् पूर्वविधिर्जातिप्रस्तारः ॥ २ ॥

विषमाश्चेन्मात्रा लघ्वादीः स्थापयत । विषममात्रासु प्रस्तार्यस्यादिभेदे प्राक् लघु स्थाप्य पुनः शेषमात्रा गुरुभिः पूर्या इत्यर्थः । यथा पञ्चानां मात्राणां प्राक् लघुः ततो गुरुद्वयम् । ११ अथ समा मात्रास्ततो गुरून्नेव स्थापय सममात्रासु प्रस्तार्यस्यादिभेदे गुरुभिरेव मात्राः पूर्या इत्यर्थः । यथा षण्णां मात्राणां गुरुत्रयम् । १११ ततः समासु विषमासु च प्राक्कल्पस्थासु य आद्यो गुरुस्तस्याधो लघुं स्थापयत । ततः परं उपरिवत् स्थापयत । यत्रोपरि गुरुस्तत्राधस्तादापि गुरुर्यत्रोपरि लघुस्तत्राधस्तादापि लघुरित्यर्थः । पश्चात् प्रस्तारे पूर्वविधिः कार्यो विषमा अवशिष्यमाणा लघ्वादिगुरुभिः समास्तु गुरुभिरेव पूर्या इत्यर्थः । यथा । सर्व × × यावदयं विधिरित्थं जातीनां प्रस्तारो ज्ञेयः । २ ॥

जातीनां नष्टादींश्चीन् प्रक्रियागौरवादुपेक्ष्य संख्यामाह ।

एकच्चिचय एमाप दुन्हं दुस्नेव तिन्ह तिस्नेव ।

अंतोवंतसमासो परत्तु मत्ताण परिसंख्या ॥ ३ ॥

[एकैवकाया द्वयोर्द्वे एव तिसृणां तिस्र एव ।

अन्तोपान्तसमासः परत्वं मात्राणां परिसंख्या ॥ ३ ॥]

एकस्या मात्रायाः प्रस्तारे एकैव संख्या । द्वयोर्द्वे एव संख्या । तिसृणां तिस्र एव संख्या । तिसृभ्यः परतश्चतुरादीनां मात्राणामन्योपान्त्यसमासः परिसंख्या । अन्यस्यैक उपान्त्यो द्विकस्तयोर्मेलनं पञ्च चतसृणां संख्या । अन्यः पञ्चक उपान्त्यस्यैकस्तन्मीलनमष्टौ पञ्चानां संख्या । अन्ययोष्टक उपान्त्यः पञ्चकस्तन्मीलनं त्रयोदश षण्णां संख्या । अन्यस्ययोदशक उपान्त्योष्टकस्तन्मीलनमेकविंशतिः सप्तानां संख्या । एवमुत्तरत्रापि । जात्यध्वयोगस्तु वृत्ताध्वयोगतुल्य एवेति नोक्तः ।

[इति कविदर्पणे षष्ठोऽध्यायः । इति कविदर्पणं सवृत्तिकं समाप्तम् ।]

BRIEF NOTES

[Hema. = Hemacandra's Chandonusāsana, N. S. P. edition, 1912.]

I. 1. Com :— सुनिश्चितनः etc. The stanza is by Siddhasena. See Hema. p. 1^a/11-12.

I. 4. Com :— वंशस्थकादि० The stanza seems to be reproduced from Hema. p. 1^b/9.

I. 5. Com :— स्पृष्टं त्वयेति etc. See Hema. p. 1^b/14-16.

I. 8. Com :— for the whole discussion of Yati, cf. Hema. p. 2^a/11ff.

II. 3. Com :-- बाहो बाहो etc. cf. Hema. p. 43^a/20ff.

मौक्तिकदाम is properly a Sanskrit metre with four lines, according to Hema. p. 7^b/19-20.

II. 8. Com :-- कमला ललिया etc. The same are quoted at Hema. p. 27^b/15ff.

II. 9. Com :-- एकेव भवति पथ्या etc. These seem to be reproduced from Hema. p. 28^b/1-3.

II. 20. Com :-- द्विजातिजाः विकल्पाः etc. This is quoted from Hema. p. 26^a 8.

II. 22. Com :-- for हेला, अधिकाक्षरा, मञ्जिरी and अराबिन्द, cf. Hema. p. 32^a/1; 33^a/8; 32^a/9, 32^b/10. Obviously, Hemacandra does not consider these metres to be the 'derivatives' of पद्यटिका; for the derivatives of खण्ड and मद्नावतार, see Hema. p. 31^b/18-20 and 33^b/2-14

II. 23. Com :-- सत्वाड वि जाईओ etc; cf. Hema. p. 35^b/1-2.

II. 25. Com :-- वंसो वित्तो० cf. Hema. p. 37^a/4-7.

II. 31. Com :-- एवं सप्तकलायेः० cf. Hema. p. 38^b/8-18.

II. 32. Com :-- धबलमिहेण० The stanza is from Svayambhū (IV. 36); but Hema. also quotes it at p. 37^b/4-5.

उत्ताहहेला० and तैरेव० both quoted at Hema. p. 38^a/7-8.

II. 33. Com :-- जइ बल्युआण० cf. Hema. p. 34^b/8.

रासावल्यस्य कुङ्कुमेन यथा etc. All examples that follow are obviously reproduced from Hema. p. 34^b/9ff. I have not been able to understand some of them correctly; hence I have not translated them. The variants offered by Hema. are not very helpful. Our readings often seem to be better.

II. 34. Com :-- The example of अथिबल is quoted from Hema. p. 37^b/7-8 by the author of Kavidarpana himself.

II. 35. Com :-- केलिकर्षभा ऊरू etc. quoted from Hema. p. 34^a/2-3.

II. 37. Com :-- उच्छलन्तच्छप्य० quoted from Hema. p. 34^b/14-17.

IV. 40. :-- युधिष्ठिराधर्ममयो०, also quoted at Hema. p. 7^a/18.

IV. 103. :-- छद्मीसक्तर. This is = Svayambhū I. 140.

IV. 103. Com :-- यत्किञ्चिद्दृश्यते० cf. Hema. p. 18^a/17.

IV. 122. Com :-- Many of these illustrations are also found in Hemacandra; cf. p. 22^a, 22^b.

Index of the Prākṛta and the Apabhraṃśa metres
in the Kavidarpaṇa, Ch. II.

आडिला II. 21.
अबदोहक II. 15.
उत्साह II. 26.
उद्गीति II. 9.
उद्दोहक II. 17.
उपगीति II. 9.
उपचित्रा II. 20.
उपदोहक II. 16.
उल्लाल See कुङ्कुम and कर्पूर.
कडवक II. 37.
कर्पूर II. 2.
काव्य See वटपद.
कीर्तिधवल II. 32.
कुङ्कुम II. 2.
खञ्जक II. 23.
खण्ड II. 22.
गलितक II. 23.
गाथा II. 4 to 8.
गीति II. 9.
घप्ता II. 29 to 31.
चन्द्रलेखा II. 24.
चित्रा II. 20.
चूडालदोहक II. 17.
तरल (दोह + संदोह) II. 34.
त्रिभङ्गी II. 36, 37.
दोहक II. 15.
द्विपदी II. 24.
द्विपदीखण्ड (खण्ड + खण्ड + गीति) II. 36.

द्विभङ्गी II. 35-37.
पञ्चाटिका II. 22.
पञ्चाननललिता II. 14.
पादाकुलक II. 20.
फुल्ल (मात्रा + उल्लाल) II. 33.
मडिला II. 21.
मदनावतार II. 22.
मलयमान्त II. 14.
मागधिका II. 18.
मात्रा II. 27-28.
मात्रासमय II. 19.
मुक्तावली II. 21.
मौक्तिकदाम II. 3.
रङ्गा See वस्तु.
रास II. 14.
रासक II. 23.
रासावलय II. 25.
वदन II. 21.
वस्तु = रङ्गा (मात्रा + दोह) II. 35.
वस्तुवदन II. 25.
वानवामिका II. 20.
विश्लोक II. 19.
श्रीधवल II. 34.
वटपद (वस्तुवदन + उल्लाल) II. 33.
संदोहक II. 16.
सार्धच्छन्दस् See वटपद.
स्कन्धक II. 9.

APPENDIX

The following are the definitions of the various metres in Nandīṣeṇa's Ajitasāntistava, given by Jinaprabhasūri in his commentary on it. See Intro. p. 5. According to him they are from Kavidarpaṇa. See last stanza. The verses are also edited by W. Schubring in Zeitschrift Für Indologie und Iranistik, 1923, p 182 ff.

माथाछन्दश्छन्दः—

नेया मत्ताछन्दे दुतिचउपचछकला गणा पंच ।

वतिपंचअदुतेरसमेइहा कचटतपनामा ॥ १ ॥

मुणि टा गुरु तथ न जो विसमे; छट्टे उ मण्णका पढमे ।

दूए उ दळंमि लहु छट्टे सत्तं सत्तं गाहा ॥ २ ॥

दुइया छट्टे पढमाउ सत्तमे लाउ कणह उवरिदले ।

नलहुंमि पंचमे पढमयाड इह तलदले विरई ॥ ३ ॥

पंचमं लहु सव्वत्थ सत्तमं दुच्चउत्थए ।

छट्टं पुण गुरुं जाण सिलोगं बिंति पंडिया ॥ ४ ॥

विसमेसु दुक्खि टगणा समेसु पोढो ततो दुच्चवि जत्थ ।

लहुओ कगणो लहुओ कगणो तं मुणह मागहियं ॥ ५ ॥

लहु दुगुरुटगणछक्कं सव्वेसु पपसु पढमतइयंमि ।

दुच्चउत्थे जमियामिणं आलिंगणयंमि छंदंमि ॥ ६ ॥

लहुतगणचउगगुरुणो पायतिए लहुयतदुगटगणदुगं ।

लहुतगणो पंतगुरू संगययं इयअणुपासं ॥ ७ ॥

गुरु लहुदुटगणपणं गुरू य सोवायणं समपपहिं ॥ ८ ॥

इदं हि षोडशाक्षरवृत्तं समवृत्तेषु संगतमिति नामान्तरेण प्रतीतं तथा छन्द-

चूडामणौ श्रीहेमचन्द्रसूरिपादाः—श्रुगौ संगतम् ।

तचपतटदुगं तदुगं पो-टचउक्क-त-च-ततिगलहुगुरुगो ।

चवुटो चचउटचटुगं तचतिणिण टपगदसय गुरु वेढो ॥ ९ ॥

टगणदुगं लहुगुरुणो टगणतिगं लहुगुरू य टगणतिगं ।

दुसरिक्कं अंतपयं रासाईलुद्धयं छंदं ॥ १० ॥

पो तदुगं लहुगुरुणो टछक्कदुगुरूटसत्तलहुगुरुगा ।

पटदुतचगुरू नवटा दुलहुगुरूटचउदोयुरुगा ॥

टदुचयुरुजुयं टतिगं दुलहुगुरू अवरवेढओ छंदं ॥ ११ ॥

टदुलहुदुगुरू पढमे दुइए टदुलहुगुरू पप तइए ।

तुरिए टदुगं सगुरू रासाईनंदियं छंदं ॥ १२ ॥

तटतटदुलहुदुगुरुआ आइदुगे तटतटतिगदुलहुगुरू ।

तुरिए तटतटजुयलं चगणगुरू चित्तलेहत्ति ॥ १३ ॥

गुरुलहुचनवगनगणो चअट्टनगणो चअट्टनगणो य ।

दसचगणा तह नगणो चगणो गुरु दुक्खि नाराओ ॥ १४ ॥

सर्वगुरुगुरुलघुरूप एवात्र चगणो ग्राह्यः ।

विसमे कलाण छक्कं समेसु अडगं निरंतरं नहु तं ।

अंते रगणो यगणो कुसुमलयानामछंदंमि ॥ १५ ॥

तगणो टगणो लहुगुरु पगणो टगणो य दुलहुगुरु दुइए ।

एवंचिय पच्छद्धं श्रुयंगपरिरेगियं छन्दं ॥ १६ ॥

भरनभनगणलहुगुरू सव्वपपसुं तहा जई दसमे ।

एवंतक्करजमियं छंदं खिज्जिययनामं तं ॥ १७ ॥

EPIC STUDIES¹

BY

V. S. SUKTHANKAR

V. NOTES ON MAHĀBHĀRATA COMMENTATORS

§ 1. Chronological Notes.

A necessary complement to a critical study of the Mahābhārata is an intensive study of the commentaries of the Mahābhārata, of which there is quite a large number preserved still, mostly in manuscript form. Among the scholiasts who have written commentaries on the Mahābhārata—either on the whole, or only on selected parts of the Great Epic—are: (1) Anantabhaṭṭa, (2) Arjunamiśra, (3) Ānanda, (4) Caturbhuja(miśra), (5) Jagadīśa-cakravartin, (6) Devabodha, (7) Nilakaṇṭha, (8) Mahānanda-pūrṇa, (9) Yajña-Nārāyaṇa, (10) Ratnagarbha, (11) Rāma-kimkara, (12) Rāmakṛṣṇa, (13) Rāmānuja, (14) Lakṣmaṇa, (15) Varada, (16) Vādirāja, (17) Vidyāsāgara, (18) Vimalabodha, (19) Śaṃkarācārya, (20) Śrīnivāsa, (21), Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa, and (22) Śrīṭṭhara. Very little is at present known about these commentators: only very few of them have been, so far, published. The only collective study made of these commentaries is by Holtzmann in *Das Mahābhārata*, Vol. 3, pp. 67 ff., and that was in 1897, that is, nearly forty years ago. The material at his disposal was very scanty, and so are his notes.

But the study of these commentaries must be now taken up more seriously, not so much for the sake of the explanations contained in the commentaries—though even the glosses of a commentator like Devabodha are extremely important—as for the readings and pāthāntaras recorded in them; because, most of

¹ For the first instalment of the series, cf. *JBBRAS* (NS). 4. 157 ff.; the following three have appeared in these *Annals*, Vol. 11, pp. 165-191, 259-283; Vol. 16, pp. 90-114.—The substance of the present study (No. V) was communicated to the International Congress of Orientalists at Leyden in 1931.

the commentaries are older—some very much older—than our manuscripts; and therefore the documentation of these readings by the commentators takes us back a stage further in our investigation of the history of the epic.

The usefulness of these commentaries is, however, considerably diminished by the fact that we know next to nothing about these commentators themselves. In particular, we lack information about their dates, which are not easy to fix in Indian literature. Even if the dates cannot be determined, it would be a great help if we could fix their relative chronology. An attempt is made in the following pages to fix, to start with, the relative chronology of some of the more important Mahābhārata commentators.

A fixed point in the exegetical literature centering round the Mbh. is furnished by Nilakanṭha, who until lately was considered, at least in India, as the most trustworthy guide for the exposition of the Great Epic, and about whose date there is not much doubt. The available personal data about him has been put together by Wilhelm Printz in the biographical note on Nilakanṭha appended to his Berlin dissertation entitled *Bhāṣāwörter in Nilakanṭha's Bhāratabhāvadīpa und in anderen Sanskritkommentaren*.¹ Nilakanṭha, according to his own statements, was a Mahārāṣṭra Brahmin of the Gautama Gotra, with the surname Caturdhara (modern Chaudhari), eldest son of Govinda Sūri and Phullāmbikā, residing at Kūrparagrāma' (modern Kopargaon) on the Godāvari. Nilakanṭha wrote his commentary on the Mbh. and on the Gaṇeśagitā (a section of the Gaṇeśapurāṇa) in Benares, in the last quarter of the seventeenth century,² the latter (Gaṇeśagitā) being composed in A. D. 1694.³

In the beginning of his commentary on the Mbh., Nilakanṭha tells us that before writing his commentary, the Bhāratabhāvadīpa, he had compared many (bahūn) copies of the Mbh., collect-

¹ *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, Vol. 44, pp. 69-109; see particularly p. 70 f.

² He was apparently a protégé of Anūpasimha, who was a contemporary of Shah Jahan.

³ The year of composition is given as Sāṃvat 1750. The name of the commentary is Gaṇapati bhāvadīpikā. Cf. the name of his Mbh. commentary, Bhāratabhāvadīpa; see next note.

ed together from different parts of India (*vibhinnadeśyān*) in order to ascertain the correct reading (*pāṭham agryam*) and also consulted older commentaries.¹ We accordingly find that he frequently mentions variant readings and "additional" passages found in the versions consulted by him, and he cites the explanations given by older scholiasts:² information, scanty though it be, of immense interest and value for the history of the received text.

(i) *Devabodha and Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa.*

In marked contrast to Nilakaṇṭha stands Devabodha, whom I regard as probably the oldest and therefore the most important commentator of the Mbh. He is extremely reticent about himself and his predecessors, but is cited or mentioned by several commentators, who must therefore have lived after him. One of such successors of Devabodha was Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa. Sarvajña's Bhāratārthaprakāśa has fortunately been preserved, though it is not definitely known whether his commentary on all the eighteen parvans of the Mbh. is now available. His commentary on the Virāṭa and the Udyoga has already been published by Mahadeva Shastri Bakre.³ The Bombay Government MSS. Collection (No. 180 of 1891-95) contains a fragment of his commentary on the Ādi, comprising merely the first adhyāya with the beginning of the second; while the Madras Government Collection (No. 2169) contains another fragment which lacks the beginning. In the colophon of the latter MS., Sarvajña is styled *paramahansa-parivrājakācārya*; he was therefore a saṁnyāsin.

Now Sarvajña explicitly refers to Devabodha in the beginning of his commentary on the Udyoga :

उद्योगे देवबोधस्य वाग्बाहवमरीचयः
पिबन्तु* ज्ञानदुर्ज्ञानवक्षोरक्तमहाणव ॥

1 बहून्समाहृत्य विभिन्नदेशान्कोशान्विनिश्चित्य च पाठमयम् ।

प्राचां गुरुणामनुसृत्य वाचमारभ्यते भारतभाषदीपः ॥

2 Cf. my Ādiparvan (Poona 1933), Prolegomena, pp. LXVff.

3 The Virāṭaparvan was published in 1915, and the Udyogaparvan in 1920, by the Gujarati Printing Press of Bombay.

* Read 'पिबन्तुज्ञान' ?

This stanza is curiously enough not found in the commentary of Sarvajña as printed in the Gujarātī Press edition of the Udyoga, but occurs in both the MSS. of the work in the Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the Institute), bearing Nos. 33 of A 1879-80 and 168 of 1884-87 respectively. The priority of Devabodha is, however, independently established by another direct reference to Devabodha in the body of the published commentary itself, to which my attention was recently drawn by my friend and colleague Professor Sushil Kumar De of Dacca University, who is editing the Udyoga for the Institute. In Sarvajña's comment on B. 5. 96. 41 (on p. 327 of the Gujarati Printing Press edition), we find :

देवबोधपादास्तु ।

कामक्रोधो लोभमोहो मदमानो तथैव च ।

मात्सर्याद्विहृती चैव क्रमादेते उदाहृताः ॥

इति । केचित्तु काकुत्स्थिकं युधिष्ठिरं ।¹

This quotation can unfortunately not be verified ; for in the very old Bengal Asiatic Society's palm-leaf MS. (No. 3399) of the unpublished commentary on the Udyoga by Devabodha the corresponding folio is missing ! But there is no reason to doubt its authenticity.

This establishes Devabodha's priority to Sarvajña. We therefore get

Series 1: Devabodha—Sarvajña

Now this Sarvajña-Nārāyana must be identical—as has indeed been assumed by Jolly,² Bühler,³ Holtzmann,⁴ and others⁵—with the Sarvajña-Nārāyana (also called Nārāyana-Sarvajña), the author of the Manvarthavṛtti or Manvarthanibandha, a

¹ This important passage was verified by me in a MS. of Sarvajña's commentary deposited at the Institute, namely, Bombay Government Collection No. 33 of A 1879-80 (fol. 194^b).

² *Tagore Lectures*, p. 11 ; passage cited in Burnell's *Tanjore Catalogue*, p. 126. Cf. also *Recht und Sitte*, p. 31.

³ *The Laws of Manu*, S. B. E., vol. 25, p. cxx.

⁴ *Das Mahābhārata und seine Theile*, Kiel 1894, 3. Band, p. 71 f.

⁵ Cf. Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra*, Poona 1930, vol. I, pp. 157, 708.

well-known commentary on the Manusmṛti, published by V. N. Mandlik.¹ The assumed identity of the two commentators at present rests, it is true, merely on the identity of the names, but can scarcely be regarded on that account as doubtful. It is hardly conceivable that there were two different Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇas, both commentators of well-known works on Dharmaśāstra like the Mahābhārata and the Manusmṛti.

The date of Sarvajña has been fixed on the basis of certain quotations.² Bühler cautiously remarks that Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa "cannot have written later than in the last half of the fourteenth century,"³ but the recent researches of Kane tend to show that Sarvajña flourished between A. D. 1100 and 1300.⁴

(ii) *Arjunamiśra*.⁵

Both Devabodha and Sarvajña are mentioned and cited several times by the Bengali commentator Arjunamiśra, the manner in which Arjunamiśra refers to Devabodha suggesting that in his time Devabodha's commentary possessed an established reputation. These references are as follows :

(a) In the foreword to his scholium (Bombay Govt. Coll. No. 30 of A 1879-80 = Da¹ of the Critical Edition), Arjuna pays homage to his predecessors, citing by name several of them. Devabodha, he mentions with special reverence, whose commentary (among others) he had carefully studied before writing his own commentary on the Mbh. :

वेदव्यासवैशंपायनदेवबोधविमलबोधसर्वज्ञनारायणशाण्डिल्यमाधवपितृभ्यो नमः ।

श्रीदेवबोधपादादिमतमालोक्य यत्नतः ।

क्रियतेऽर्जुनमिश्रेण भारतार्थमदीपिका ॥

Worth noting is the fact that in the long series of names of Bhāratācāryas cited by Arjuna at the beginning of the above extract, the first four names Vyāsa and Vaiśampayāna, Devabodha

¹ *Mānava-Dharma-Śāstra*, Bombay 1886.

² Cf. R. G. Bhandarkar's *Report on the Search for Skt. MSS.* for 1883-84, p. 62.

³ Bühler, *op. cit.* p. cxxix.

⁴ Kane, *op. cit.* p. 157.

⁵ See also my paper on Arjunamiśra in the Sir J. J. Modi Commemoration Volume, p. 565.

and Sarvajña have been recited in the correct order of precedence and chronology, a point to which we shall return in the sequel.

(b) Arjuna mentions the Ācāryas again in the list of his (immediate and remote) "Gurus", placing this time Devabodha at the head of the list, which ends with the name of his father, who (as we know from other sources) was a well-known reciter (*pāṭhaka*)¹ of the Mbh. :

श्रीदेवबोधविमलबोधशाण्डिल्यमाधवाः ।

नारायणश्च सब्रह्मः पिता च एवमा मम ॥

(c) In the short introduction which prefaces his commentary on the Virāṭa,² Arjuna twice mentions Devabodha, once to give expression to the high esteem in which Arjuna holds him and again to record his gratefulness to his illustrious predecessor :

वेदव्यासमुखाभोजगलितं वाङ्मयाश्नुतम् ।

संभोजयन्तं भुवनं देवबोधं भजामहे ॥

... ..

श्रीदेवबोधपादादितातोपदेशसेविना ।

क्रियतेऽर्जुनमिश्रेण विराटपर्वदीपिका ॥

(d) Finally, while commenting on 1. 143. 34 (a difficult stanza, giving a fanciful derivation of the name Ghaṭotkaca), Arjuna mentions two readings, which had both won the approval of Devabodha :

शेषपाठद्वयं देवबोधपादिनी (sic) संमतम् ।³

These two readings are *in fact* mentioned by Devabodha : vide fol. 37^b of the Baroda MS. of Devabodha's commentary on the Ādi.

The above extracts taken together indisputably prove that Arjunamiśra was posterior to both Devabodha and Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa. Adding the name of Arjunamiśra to Series 1, we get

Series 2: Devabodha-Sarvajña-Arjunamiśra.

Some faint light on the question of the age of Arjunamiśra is thrown by a dated MS. of Arjuna's commentary listed by the late MM. Haraprasada Sāstri in his *Notices of Sanskrit MSS.*, Second

¹ See my "Arjunamiśra," p. 566.

² Gujarati Printing Press edition, p. 1 (right column).

³ Read देवबोधपादानां संमतम् ?

Series, Vol. I (Calcutta 1900), p. 298 (MS. No. 295). The late Mahamahopadhyaya reported that it was a carefully written palm-leaf MS. of Arjuna's commentary on the Mokṣadharmā, called Mokṣadharmārthadīpikā, written in archaic Bengali characters and belonging, apparently, to Babu Saradaprasanna Ghose of Kelomal, Tamluk. The MS. gave the date of writing as Śaka 1456 (ca. A. D. 1534).¹

I may here draw attention to some stanzas added by the copyist, which are to the effect that already at the time when the copy was made, correct MSS. of Arjuna's commentary were a rarity even in Bengal, the home of the commentator, which can only be explained by assuming, as pointed out already by Mahadeva Shastri Bakre that there was a considerable interval of time between the two. The stanzas I am referring to are :

पितुः सदुपदेशेन विद्वद्भात्रनुरोधतः ।
 प्राङ्निबन्धस्य संशुद्धौ कृता यत्नोऽधुना मया ॥
 अल्पाधीतीलिपिग्रन्थशुद्धाक्षरसमुच्चयः ।
 विदुषां हेलया प्राच्यग्रन्थो नाशमुपेयिवान् ॥

The date Śaka 1456 (ca. A. D. 1534) is then the lower limit of the age of Arjuna, but the date of Arjuna, if we rely on the information vouchsafed by the copyist, must be long prior to A. D. 1534.

(iii) *Nilakanṭha*.

We return to Nilakanṭha, who is the next great Mbh. commentator, and who cites or mentions Devabodha, Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa and Arjunamiśra, not indeed in the introduction to his commentary on the Mbh., where he mentions a number of his "Gurus", but elsewhere in the course of his well-known scholium. Here are the references.

(a) While commenting on l. 158. 14, a stanza with numerous variants, Nilakanṭha cites an old variant of the entire stanza, mentioning Devabodha in that connection.

न नहताः शृङ्गिणो वा न च देवाऽनमज्जः ।
 कुबेरस्य यथोष्णीषं किं मां समुपसर्पथ ॥

¹ The reference is given in the Gujarati Printing Press edition of the Virāṭaparvan, Introduction, p. 6.

इति प्राचीनः पाठो देवबोधादिभिर्व्याख्यातत्वात् ।¹

It is worthy of note that Nilakanṭha regards the variant as *ancient*, owing to its having been explained by "Devabodha and others". He must therefore consider Devabodha as an ancient authority.

What Nilakanṭha regards as ancient is of course a matter for speculation. Nevertheless I do not think that Nilakanṭha would have used the word *prācīna* in connection with Devabodha unless the interval between them was at least three or four centuries.

In passing it may be mentioned that this reference to Devabodha by Nilakanṭha is yet another instance of the practice of mentioning names of Ācāryas *honoris causa* (pūjārtham),² because the reading cited by Nilakanṭha is probably not that of Devabodha at all, who to judge by the lemmata in his commentary must have had before him a stanza differing from the corresponding stanza of the Critical Edition, merely in reading *śakunāḥ* for *kuṇapāḥ* of the Critical Edition (l. 158. 14). The third pāda of the stanza as cited by Nilakanṭha is certainly the reading of the T G version, found otherwise only in three conflated N MSS., and in a fourth one written in the *margin*; while the last pāda was found by me only in four MSS. (K²B³M³. 5) of my critical apparatus, one of them (B³) having as a matter of fact the reading of our text in the *margin*! It is therefore most improbable that Devabodha had commented on the particular variant version cited by Nilakanṭha, and it is really doubtful to me whether Nilakanṭha had at all Devabodha's commentary before him. Devabodha is referred to by Nilakanṭha merely as one of the ancient Ācāryas.

(b) While commenting on B. 7. 82. 2, Nilakanṭha notices a variant interpretation of *madhuparkika* given by Devabodha :

मधुपर्किकाः मधुपर्कसमये पठन्तीति देवबोधः ।

(c) Nilakanṭha's reference to Sarvajña will be found in his comment on B. 5. 40. 10 (Gujarati Printing Press ed., p. 131) :

¹ This passage was already cited by me in the Critical Edition of the *Ādiparvan*, p. 666.

² Cf. *ZDMG.* Vol. 66 (1912), p. 541 f.

विषं लोहमिति सर्वज्ञः । स्वर्णनाभः शालग्रामः । दक्षिणार्धः शङ्ख इति नारायणः ।
and again in the same adhyāya, a few stanzas further on (B. 5. 40. 26), we find :

परिसंस्तीर्याग्निं परित्स्तरणैः । एतेनाग्निदोत्रमुपलक्षयतीति नारायणः । परिसंस्तीर्य
वितत्य । स्वे स्वे स्थाने आधायेत्यर्थः ।

A reference to Sarvajña's commentary printed in the same work (p. 131 f.) will show that all these explanations do as a matter of fact occur in the commentary of Sarvajña, while they are not met with in any of the three other commentaries printed there.

(d) For Nilakanṭha's mention of Arjunamiśra, I may draw attention to Nilakanṭha's comment on B. 3. 291. 70, a stanza at the end of the Rāmopākhyāna, where he mentions various explanations of the word *jārūthya*, among them the one given by Arjunamiśra, whom he mentions by name:

जारूथ्यान् त्रिगुणदक्षिणानिति अर्जुनमिश्रः ।

These various extracts establish the posteriority of Nilakanṭha to Devabodha, Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa and Arjunamiśra. Adding Nilakanṭha to Series 2, we get

Series 3 : Devabodha—Sarvajña—

Arjunamiśra—Nilakanṭha.

It will be remembered that as each member of this series of four names clearly cites one or more of his predecessors, this is a chronological sequence whose correctness is absolutely incontrovertible.

(iv) Vimalabodha.

There is moreover a subsidiary series connected with a Mbh. commentator called Vimalabodha,¹ to which we shall now turn our attention.

It will be recalled that in the excerpts given above from the commentary of Arjunamiśra, the commentator twice mentions Vimalabodha in close proximity to Devabodha. Therefore it is evident that Arjunamiśra is posterior to Vimalabodha, whose commentary (*ṭikā*) variously known as *Durghaṭārthaprakāśinī*

¹ See Holtzmann, *op. cit.* vol. 3 p. 72.

or Viṣamaśloki has fortunately been preserved. In the introduction to this unpublished commentary, a copy of which is to be found in the Bombay* Government Collection (No. 84 of 1869- 0), while speaking of his predecessors, Vimalabodha says (fol. 1) :

निघण्टुभाष्यनिगमनिरुक्तानि विशेषतः ।

वैशंपायनटीकादि देवस्वामिमतानि च ।

वीक्ष्य व्याख्या विराचता दुर्घटार्थप्रकाशिनी ॥

Again while giving the etymologies of the name of the Sūta, Loma (or Roma)harsana, Vimalabodha observes (fol. 2) :

पश्यतां मुनीनां अतिविस्मयमुत्पादितवान इति लोमहर्षणनामाश्चर्येति देवबोधपादा
आहः ।

Undoubtedly the Devasvāmin mentioned in the first excerpt is the same as the Devabodha (who in the colophons of his commentary is styled *paramahansa-parivrājakācārya*) in the second. Incidentally it may be pointed out that the etymology of Loma- (or Roma)harsana mentioned by Vimalabodha is actually to be found in Devabodha's scholium. In the Baroda MS. (11372) of the unpublished commentary of Devabodha, we read (fol. 3 b, line 1 f.) :

पश्यतां मुनीनामतिविस्मयात् रोमाश्चमुत्पादितवानिति लोमहर्षणनामाश्चत् । ,
which substantially agrees with the excerpt in the commentary of Vimalabodha.

Since Arjunamiśra mentions Vimalabodha, and Vimalabodha cites Devabodha, we get a subsidiary series, namely,

Series 4: Devabodha-Vimalabodha-Arjunamiśra.

Thus far we have been treading on solid ground and the correctness of Series 1-4 is, as far as I can judge, absolutely unimpeachable.

In trying to combine Series 3 and 4, however, there arises the difficulty that no cross reference has hitherto been found in the works of Vimalabodha on the one hand and Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa on the other. Their relative chronological position is, therefore, a matter for speculation. It is possible, however, to combine the two series *tentatively*, on the equivocal testimony of Arjunamiśra, which we shall proceed to examine more closely.

In one of the lists of the Ācāryas cited by Arjunamiśra, we have the sequence: Veda-Vyāsa, Vaiśampāyana, Devabodha, Vimalabodha, Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa, Śaṇḍilya Mādhava. Here the first two pairs, as was pointed out above, have been named in the correct chronological order, the earlier author being placed first, in conformity with the rule governing the sequence of the members of a Dvandva compound (P. 2.2.34 Vā.). Devabodha is, as we have seen, prior to Vimalabodha as surely as Vyāsa, the reputed author of the Great Epic, is prior to Vaiśampāyana. Further in both lists the father of Arjunamiśra is mentioned last. These facts suggest the surmise that the whole series is arranged in the strict chronological sequence. If this surmise be correct, then Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa would be posterior to Vimalabodha, and we get, tentatively, the sequence: Vimalabodha-Sarvajña.

It may, however, be noted that such names are often found arranged on the diametrically opposite principle of *uttarottara-garīyastva*, i. e., naming the more important persons later, which is however not admissible in the particular instance; or even arranged on no principle at all; or at least on some principle which it is difficult for us to comprehend. In fact a subsequent enumeration of these same Ācāryas by the same Arjunamiśra is in partial conflict with the earlier list! There the sequence (already given above) is Devabodha, Vimalabodha, Śaṇḍilya Mādhava, Nārāyaṇa-Sarvajña. Here Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa has been placed *after* Śaṇḍilya Mādhava, while in the former list he is placed *before* them! This irregularity apart, the lists tally with each other.

It is not, however, impossible to resolve this contradiction and harmonize the data. There is a notable difference between the two lists. The first one is in prose, the second is an *anustubh* stanza. I am disposed to attach more importance to the sequence of the prose enumeration, and to regard the change of sequence in the other as due to the exigencies of metre. The first again is a formal expression of homage (*namaskriyā*), where the principle of priority has been, it seems, rigidly observed; on the other hand, the second is merely a collective metrical list of the author's "Gurus," where the consideration of rank and precedence did

not perhaps prevail so much. I may also point out that the first list is in the form of a Dvandva compound, while in the second the persons have been all *independently* mentioned. If these considerations have any value, then we may postulate, at least tentatively, another series,

*Series 5: Devabodha—Vimalabodha—
Sarvajña—Arjuna—Nilakanṭha,*

where the relative position of Vimalabodha and Sarvajña alone is open to doubt.

Of these five commentators, as was mentioned above, Sarvajña could not have lived later than the latter half of the fourteenth century and flourished probably between A. D. 1100 and 1300; while Arjunamiśra lived some time prior to A. D. 1534.¹ Moreover, if the position assigned in Series 5 to Sarvajña be correct, then both Devabodha and Vimalabodha must have lived long prior to A. D. 1300.²

*

*

*

§ 2. What was Devabodha's version of the Mahābhārata like ?

The only commentary of the Mahābhārata completely printed so far is the Bhāratabhāvadīpa by Nilakanṭha. The Gujarati Printing Press of Bombay has done, however, inestimable service to the cause of Mahābhārata studies by publishing other commentaries at least on the Virāṭa and Udyoga, edited by Mahadeva Shastri

¹ Since the above was written, two efforts have been made to fix the date of Arjunamiśra. Mr. Jogendra Chandra Ghosh (*Indian Culture*, Vol. I, p. 706 ff.), working on the data supplied by certain ancient pedigrees preserved in Bengal, arrives at the date ca. A. D. 1300 for Arjunamiśra; but it may be pointed out that the method of fixing precise dates on the basis of pedigrees alone never gives *entirely* reliable results. On the other hand, Mr. P. K. Gode of the Bhandarkar Institute (*Indian Culture*, Vol. 2, p. 141 ff.), relying on his identification of the Satya-Khāna, who was a patron of Arjunamiśra (see Sir J. J. Modi Commemoration Volume, p. 566), argues for a date between A. D. 1450 and A. D. 1500. There is thus a difference of about 200 years between the two computations. But the matter is still *sub judice*, and more light on the question may be expected from further investigation of the question which is being carried on by these two scholars.

² See further the Appendix at the end of this paper (below, p. 202).

Bakre. The Virāṭaparvan Volume (published in 1915) contains, besides (1) the Bhāratabhāvadīpa, the commentaries of (2) Arjunamiśra, (3) Caturbhuja, (4) Vimalabodha, (5) Rāmakaṣṇa, (6) Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa and (7) Vādirāja, as also a commentary called (8) the Viśamapadavivarāṇa of unknown authorship. The Udyogaparvan Volume (published in 1920) includes, on the other hand, besides (1) the Bhāratabhāvadīpa, the commentaries of (2) Arjunamiśra, (3) Vimalabodha, (4) Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa and (5) Vādirāja.¹ A commentary more important than any of these and one more neglected still is the Jñānadīpikā of Devabodha. Until recently nothing was in fact known about Devabodha or his commentary on the Mahābhārata save what is contained in perfunctory notices of Sankrit MSS., which has been summarized in Holtzmann's meritorious work *Das Mahābhārata* (Vol. 3, section 14, para 3, p. 70 f.). A selection of Devabodha's readings and glosses was for the first time published by me in the critical notes of the Ādiparvan Volume.²

I have shown in the previous section that Devabodha is indubitably earlier than Nilakaṇṭha, Arjunamiśra, Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa or even Vimalabodha, and is therefore in all probability the earliest commentator of the Mahābhārata hitherto known. It is therefore needless to add that the commentary is most valuable and its evidence, both positive and negative, of supreme importance for the constitution of the text.

The MS. of the commentary (which is *unaccompanied* by the epic text) utilized by me for the Ādi belongs to the Baroda Central Library (Sanskrit Section) and was kindly placed at my disposal by Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharya, Director of the Oriental Institute of Baroda, to whom my sincere thanks are due for the kind loan.³ This paper MS. which bears the identification No. 11372, contains the commentary on Ādi only and is written in

¹ Vādirāja's commentary on the Sabhā has been published by Prof. P. P. Subrahmanya Sastri as an Appendix to his edition of the Sabhā according to the Southern recension (Madras 1932). For Vādirāja's date see further below (pp. 203-210) the note on the subject by Mr. P. K. Gode.

² See also my Prolegomena, p. LXX.

³ There is another MS. of the commentary in the Asiatic Society of Bengal, which was also consulted by me.

Devanāgarī characters of about the seventeenth century. The bulk of the MS. is in a fair state of preservation, though in many places the text is extremely corrupt. In our MS. the name of the commentary is given as Jñānadīpikā; but, according to Holtzmann (*op. cit.* Vol. 3, p. 71), it is also known as Mahābhārata-tātparyatikā or tātparyadīpikā. MSS. of this commentary are rare, and no complete copy has yet been found.

In the colophon the author is described as *paramahansa-pirivrajaka*. He must therefore have belonged to an order of Samnyāsins. The name of his Guru is given as Satyabodha. This is all the personal data we have at present about Devabodha.

The Jñānadīpikā is a concise *ṭikā*, that is, a running commentary paraphrasing the difficult words of the epic text and occasionally explaining the gist or purport (*tālparya*) of the original. The extent of the text of the commentary on the Ādi is given at the end of our MS. as 1400 granthas.

The homage which Arjuna pays to Devabodha in the Introduction to his scholium is by no means a matter of mere form. Arjuna appears to have made a very close study indeed of the scholium of Devabodha, and based his own commentary, on the Ādi at least, largely on that of his predecessor. He has copied very large portions of Devabodha's commentary, sometimes *verbatim*, sometimes in extracts. Moreover, even when the commentators differ, the influence of Devabodha is plainly discernible. In fact, Arjuna's Arthadīpikā may be considered, as I have remarked elsewhere,¹ as a revised and enlarged edition of Devabodha's Jñānadīpikā. Unlike the commentary of Nilakantha, that of Devabodha is unaccompanied by the epic text. The question, therefore, naturally arises what was Devabodha's text like ?

When we read the commentary along with any of the old printed editions of the Mahābhārata, like the Calcutta or the Bombay or the Kumbhakonam editions, we are at once struck by the singular disparity between the text and the commentary. Not only does Devabodha's commentary contain many words or expressions which do not occur at all in the Vulgate, but it also cites, at times, verses or stanzas which read differently in the

Vulgate. One also comes across passages and even *adhyāyas* of the Vulgate on which one expects some comment but which are left wholly uncommented by Devabodha.

The Southern recension may be categorically ignored in our search for the prototype of Devabodha's commentary, as this commentator does not know even a single one of the many passages peculiar to the Southern recension. He further does not show the typical Southern transposition of the Śakuntalā and Yayāti episodes, nor the characteristic position of the prose genealogical *adhyāya* (called *Pūruvaṃśānukīrtana*), after the chapter containing the eulogy of the epic (*Bhūrataprasānsā*).

The vulgate (with the Bengali) may likewise be excluded. It agrees with Devabodha's text up to a certain point ; but the divergences, which are numerous, remain inexplicable. There remain then only the Śāradā and the " K " versions. And with them, the version of Devabodha does, as a matter of fact, show very close affinity.

It is worthy of note that Devabodha has no commentary on any of the six *adhyāyas* of the Vulgate which are completely missing in the Śāradā and the K MSS. and which have also been completely omitted in the Critical Edition of the Ādi. They are the following *adhyāyas* of the *Vulgate* : (i) *adhy.* 22 (duplicate description of the ocean) ; (ii) *adhy.* 24 (Aruṇa is appointed charioteer of the Sun, an evident digression and interpolation) ; (iii) *ādhy.* 116 (birth of Duḥśalā : a fairy tale of questionable authenticity) ; (iv) *adhy.* 139 (an absurd chapter describing further exploits of the Pāṇḍavas and containing a reference to Yavana kings) ; (v) *adhy.* 140 (*Kaṇikanṭi*) ; and finally, (vi) *adhy.* 149 (Pāṇḍavas' crossing of the Ganges, a passage of doubtful value).

But on principle, we cannot attach very great importance to such omissions, as a commentator is apt to skip in the Mahābhārata any *adhyāya* which he thinks too simple to need any comment. This explanation will apply to most of the omissions mentioned above, but will not hold good in the case of the *Kaṇikanṭi*, an *adhy.* of 140 stanzas, which has evoked lengthy comments from both Arjunamīśra and Nilkaṇṭha; we expect some comment on this *adhyāya* by a commentator like Devabodha.

Much more important from our point of view is an *addition* characteristic of the Kaśmīrī version. This version adds at the very end of the Ādi a supplementary (and entirely superfluous) adhyāya, which contains merely a *variant* version of the well-known Puranic tale of Śvetaki's sacrifice, occurring earlier in the course of this very parvan, and which was known to Kṣemendra. Curiously enough the king who is called Śvetaki in the first version is here called Śvetaketu ! That the version of Devabodha contained this interpolated (supplementary) adhyāya is proved by the concluding remark of Devabodha on this adhyāya (fol. 48) :

श्वेतकिरेव श्वेतकेतुरिति नाम ।

This remark, as I have pointed out elsewhere, will not apply to any version which did not have the supplementary adhyāya containing the story of Śvetaketu, which in fact is peculiar to the Śāradā and the K versions. These facts demonstrate that the version of Devabodha agrees with the Śāradā and K versions with respect to both addition and omission of whole adhyāyas.

The conclusion regarding the affinity between the two versions is fortified by many minor agreements in point of shorter passages and even readings of individual stanzas.

For example, Devabodha has no comment on any portion of the Brahmā-Gaṇeśa episode (40 stanzas in the Vulgate), which is missing in its *entirety* only in the Kaśmīrī and the Bengali versions. Again, for l. 105. 4-7 of the Critical Edition the Vulgate substitutes a lengthy passage of 56 lines, which is entirely ignored in the commentary of Devabodha, who on the other hand *cites* 7^{ab} (a line not known to the Vulgate), in exact agreement with the Śāradā and K versions (besides the Southern recension), but in direct opposition to the Bengali and the Devanāgarī versions. In connection with the omission of adhy. 139-140 of the Vulgate mentioned above, the Śāradā and K versions omit the first 19 stanzas of the following adhyāya (namely, adhy. 141 of the Vulgate). In conformity with that, the first 19 stanzas of adhy. 141 are ignored completely in the scholium of Devabodha. It may be noted that the omission of adhy. 139-140 together with the first 19 stanzas of adhy. 141 of the Vulgate

makes an aggregate and continuous omission of 139 (= 27 + 93 + 19) stanzas of the Vulgate, a not inconsiderable portion of the text. Likewise there is no commentary on nearly 70 stanzas of adhy. 128 and 129 of the Vulgate, which are omitted only in the Śāradā-K group and the Critical Edition.

This affinity is further borne out by agreements as regards minor readings too numerous to mention.

These considerations make it, in my opinion, perfectly clear that the version of Devabodha is closely allied to the Śāradā and the K versions.

Though the Śāradā version and what I have called the "K" version run for the most part parallel to each other, there are in fact minor discrepancies between the MSS. of these versions, which indicate different sources. But as, on the one hand, we have for the Ādi a solitary MS. (Ś¹) of the genuine Śāradā (or Kaśmīri) version, and on the other hand we do not know the provenance of the Devanāgarī MSS. which I have denoted by the symbol "K" (on account of their affinity to the version of Kaśmīr), it is at this stage not easy to explain these discrepancies between Śāradā and K. It would be also premature to say whether Devabodha's version was more akin to Śāradā or the K version.

[I may, however, draw attention to one instance which suggests to my mind an affinity with K rather than with the Śāradā version. In l. 68. 72 the text reading is *asatyavacanā nūryaḥ* (nom. plu.), "women (are) perfidious," a general statement. Only K^{1,2} B¹ (m as in text) have, on the other hand, *asatyavacane 'nūrye* (voc. sing.), "O thou perfidious (and) dishonourable (woman)!" K^o. 4 appear to have corrupt forms of the same. The vocative appears to be, therefore, peculiar to the K version, which differs here from the Śāradā, and which latter has the nom. plu. as in all other MSS. Now in agreement with K, Devabodha has *anūrye=vakre*! One instance of an agreement like this is, I will readily admit, wholly inadequate to prove the point. It can only give an indication and may perchance give wrong indication. The question may, therefore, be left over for future investigation.

APPENDIX.

List of five major Mahābhārata commentators arranged according to the probable chronological sequence, with the names of their commentaries, approximate date, and sundry data about them.

No.	Commentator	Commentary	Age	Remarks
1	Devabodha	Jñānadīpikā, Mbh.-tātparyā- tikā, Tātparyadīpikā		Samnyāsin; pupil of Satyabodha, mentioned or cited by Vimala, Arj., Nil.
2	Vimalabodha	Viśamaśloka- tikā, Durghatārtha- prakāśinī, Durbodhapa- dabhañjinī		Mentions Vaiśam- pāyana's Tīkā and cites Devabodha (once as °svāmin).
3	Sarvajña Nārāyaṇa	Bhāratārtha- prakāśa	Ante 1300	Mentions Dev. and is cited by Arj. and Nil., as also by a le- xicographer Rāya- mukūṭa. (A. D. 1431).
4	Arjunamiśra	Mahābhāratār- tha(pra)dīpikā, Bhāratasaṃ- grahadīpikā	Ante 1534	Mentions Dev., Vim- ala, S. Nārāyaṇa, Sā- ndilya Mādhava. Belongs to Eastern (or Gauda) school. Cited by Nil. One MS. of his comm. dated Saka 1456 (= ca. A. D. 1534). ¹
5	Nilakantha Caturdhara	Bhāratabhāva- dīpa.	ca. 1700	Maharāstra Brahmin. Son of Govindasūri and Phullāmbikā, resi- dent of Kopargaon on the Godavari. Men- tions Dev., S. Nārā- yaṇa, Arj. Ratna- garbha and others.

¹ For Arjunamiśra's date, see also Mr. J. C. Ghosh's recent paper in *Indian Culture*, vol. 2 (1936), pp. 585 ff.

Prof. P. P. S. SASTRI, AND
THE DATE OF VĀDIRĀJATĪRTHA

BY

P. K. GODE, M. A.

Prof P. P. S. Sastri, in his Introduction to Vol. III. (Sabbāparvan) of the Southern Recension of the *Mahābhārata*, p. xi. makes the following remarks about the date of Vādirājatīrtha and his commentary on the Mahābhārata :—

“Reference has already been made to the *Lakṣālaṃkāra* of Vādirāja, the contemporary of Vāgīśatīrtha, one of the apostolic successors of Ānandatīrtha the great dualistic philosopher. Vādirāja died in * 1261 Śaka or 1339 A. D. (Vide R. G. Bhandarkar's Collected Works, Vol. II, p. 7 ¹.) The *Lakṣālaṃkāra* is very valuable as it *may possibly turn out to be the earliest dated commentary on the Mahābhārata*”.

* I owe this information to my revered guru and colleague Mahāmahopādhyāya S. Kuppaswami Sastrigal.

Being interested in the chronology of the commentaries on the Mahābhārata I felt much interested in the above remarks of Prof. Sastri about Vādirājatīrtha's date and began to read some of the works of this erudite philosopher with a view to gather chronological data. To begin with I perused his *Tīrthaprabandhakāvya* from a Ms in the Govt. Mss. Library at the Bhandarkar Institute (No. 622 of 1882-83). This poem contains description of the places of pilgrimage and the deities presiding over them in different parts of India. In particular I was much impressed by Vādirāja's description of (1) the

¹ In *Duff's Chronology of India* (1899) this date for Vādirāja has been incorporated as under on page 210 :—

A. D. 1339—Ś. 1261—Death of Vādirāja, said to be same as Kavindra, 8th successor of Ānandatīrtha in the Madhva Sect. " (*Bhandarkar's Report* 1882-83, pp. 8, 203).

Vīṭhobā of Pandharpur ¹ (Sholapur District) and (2) Mahā-lakṣmī of Kolhapur. ² Further while describing the पन्थाक्षेत्र on the banks of the Tungabhadra river Vādirāja was found to refer to god विठ्ठल ³. This reference roused my curiosity still further as the verse containing this reference contains the tradition current in the Maratha country about the transfer of the image of Vīṭhobā from Pandharpur to Vijayanagar

¹ Verses 5 to 8 on folio 10a refer to God विठ्ठल of Pandharpur :—

“ श्री भीमरथ्यमलनीरसमीरवेग-
निधूततीरगतराशुभघर्मजालम् ।
श्रीपांडुरंगलभितं वरपुंडरीक-
क्षेत्रं पवित्रमहमन्वहमाश्रितोऽस्मि ॥ ५ ॥

तीरे सत्सरितस्तिरस्कृतधनासक्तिर्विराक्तिप्रियः
पादांभोजमिदं मदंकमहितः संचितयातर्हृदि ।
पश्चात्ते कटिमात्र एव भविता संसारवर्द्धिनचे-
क्षिणामूर्तिहि लक्षयत्यनुदिनं स्वावस्थया विठ्ठलः ॥ ६ ॥

पापावली पाठनपटुपांगः
श्रीपाणिपद्मांचितजानुजंघः ।
गोपालबालः रूपया स्वयं नः
श्रीपांडुरंगो भवतु प्रसन्नः ॥ ७ ॥
पापाघनोदनपटुप्रियभृत्यभृंगैः
पेपीयमानशुभसुंदरतारसांद्रं ।
तापत्रयोपशमनं तरणार्कवर्णं
गोपालबालचरणांबुरुहं श्रितोऽस्मि ॥ ८ ॥”

² The verse referring to the Mahālakṣmī of Kolhapur reads as follows on folio 8 :—

“ अमानवजनस्थानसरसीकुलसंकुले ।
रमा कोल्हापुरक्षेत्रे* वसतीति किमद्भुतम् ॥ ८५ ॥ ”

* In an inscription (dated 1st February 1147) of Silāhara Vijayāditya on a Jain Temple near Sukrawar Gate (Kolhapur) शृङ्गकपुर is recorded as another name for Kolhapur (Vide Ep. Ind. Vol. III, p. 209).

³ The description of पन्थाक्षेत्र and the reference to विठ्ठल will be found in the following verses on folios 15-16 :—

“ तटिनीषु तुंगभद्रे स्वादूदकसंकुला त्वमसि नूनम् ।
कस्मात्तथैषदोसो धत्ते त्वामिव दंष्ट्रयोर्नो चेत् ॥ १२ ॥

(Continued on the next page)

on the banks of the Tungabhadra. I found this tradition referred to in one of the Maratha Chronicles.

Malhar Ramrao Chitnis in his *Life of Shivāji*¹ composed in A. D. 1811 states that the image of Viṭhobā was transferred from Pandharpur to Vidyānagar or Vijayanagar as the Vijayanagar kings were great upholders of Hinduism and full of devotion to Gods and Brahmans. Later in the same context he mentions the names Jñāneśvara and Bhānudāsa without mentioning the re-transfer of the image back to Pandharpur.

Mr. K. N. Sane the editor of the above *bakhar* of Chitnis in his notes on the above mentioned passage of the Bakhar in question makes the following remarks².—

“ Rāmrajā of Vidyānagar transferred the Viṭhobā of Pandhari to Vijayanagar from whence he was brought back by sage Bhānudāsa of Paithāṇa (see Mahipati's *Bhaktivijaya* chapter 43) It was possibly in the reign of Kṛṣṇadevarāya (1509-1530) that Viṭhobā was taken from Pandhari to Vidyānagar. It is likely

चोर्यान्मातृनिबद्धचारुचरणः पापौघचोर्याद्बुधैः ।
 बद्धस्त्वं पाथि पुंडरीकमुनिना* जरेति संबोधितः ।
 तुंगातीरगतोऽसि विद्वल भियेवाभ्याकृतिं वाञ्छितम् ।
 वेत्तनां यदि मे न दास्यति तदा त्वत्संस्थितिः कथ्यते ॥ १३ ॥
 पंपाध्यक्षो विरूपाक्षः संपदे स्यात्सतां सदा ।
 ग्रे. हेमगिरिसीमायां राजते राजशेखरः ॥ १४ ॥ ”

* In a Sanskrit inscription dated Śaka 1159 (= A. D. 1237) in Viṭhobā's temple at Pandharpur the story of the boon to Puṇḍalika is referred to with the only difference that पुंडरीक is there called a Sage or मुनि (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XX, p. 420) Vādirāja also refers to पुंडरीक as मुनि.

Compare also the following remarks of John Wilson in his article “*Ancient Remains of Western India* (J. B. B. R. A. S. Vol. III, Jan. 1850) p. 87—
 “ The celebrated temple of Viṭhobā near Pandharpur is supposed to be a Buddhist structural temple now appropriated by the Brahmans. It certainly has the appearance of great antiquity. The oversight of the distinction of caste among the natives who frequent this shrine, when in the presence of the idol would seem to indicate some compromise with the Buddhists. In villages near Pandharpur we have noted other ancient temples probably Buddhist which are entirely forsaken and which bear the marks of violence probably Brahmanical or Musalman.”

¹ Edited by Mr. K. N. Sane, Poona 1924, Pages 7-8.

² Ibid, p. 38.

that the temple of Viṭṭhalasvāmi at Vijayanagar may have been commenced during his reign. The construction of this temple was completed about A. D. 1542 during the reign of Acyutarāya the brother of Kṛṣṇadevarāya (vide Sardesai's Musalmani Riyasat page 200, section 51). At that time Rāmarāya the son-in-law of Kṛṣṇadevarāya was the Prime Minister of the state and he continued in that capacity from 1542 to 1565 A. D. As he was practically in power he is called " Kiriṭi Rāmarājā " in the Chitnis Bakhar "¹

According to the tradition referred to in Mr. Sane's foregoing remarks the transfer of Viṭhobā to Vijayanagar took place in the *middle of the 16th century* while if the date of Vādirājatīrtha was correct this transfer would appear to have taken place before A. D. 1339, the date of Vādirāja's death, as given by Prof. P. P. S. Sastri on the authority of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar. The difference between the dates for this tradition being

¹ *Vijayanagar Third Dynasty* by Prof. N. V. Ramanayya, Madras, 1935—व्यासतिर्थ the greatest exponent of Madhvaism had much influence with Kṛṣṇadevarāya (p. 322). He set up the image of नरसिंहस्वामी in the courtyard of Viṭṭhala temple at Hampi (p. 323) and died a little later in A. D. 1532.

On p. 439 Prof. Ramanayya observes :— " He (i. e. Kṛṣṇarāya) must have undertaken to reconstruct the Viṭṭhalsvāmi temple during the last years of his reign which he was obliged to leave unfinished at the time of his death "..... " The construction of the Viṭṭhalsvāmi's Temple is usually attributed to Kṛṣṇadevarāya but he could not have built that temple as it existed even in the time of Devarāya II. We learn from Haribhaṭṭa, who lived in the first quarter of the 16th century that Proluganṭi Tippana, one of Devarāya's officers built a *bhogamaṇṭapa* for Viṭṭhala " at Hampi.

Dr. B. A. Saletore in his *Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagar Empire*, Vol. II. (1934) p. 163 observes :— " Acyutarāya's gift of *Suvarṇameru* was commemorated in a Sanskrit verse composed by Vōḍuva Tirumalamma (A. D. 1533) and inscribed in the Viṭṭhala Temple at Hampi. "

Mr. A. H. Longhurst in his *Hampi Ruins* (1917) p. 124 remarks :— " The temple was never finished nor consecrated. In all probability the work was stopped by the destruction of the city in 1565, but tradition gives another reason and says that it was built specially for the famous image of Viṭhobā at Pandharpur in Sholapur district of Bombay but that the god having come to look at it, refused to move, saying that it was too grand for him and that he preferred his own humbler home. " (A fine photograph of Viṭṭhala Temple at Hampi appears on p. 126 of Mr. Longhurst's book showing its architectural grandeur).

See also *Epi. Carnatica* Vol. XI, p. 137—Inscription dated 1533 A. D.—God Viṭṭhaleśvara is referred to.

more than 200 years it could not but raise doubts in my mind about the date of Vādirāja as recorded in the *Succession Lists of the High Priests of the Madhva Sect*,¹ as recorded by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar in his Report for 1882-83 (p. 203 onwards). I also reported this contradiction between the two dates to my friends Prof. S. V. Dandekar, M. A. of the S. P. College, Poona, who has made a special study of the literature about the Viṭhobā of Pandharpur as also Dr. B. A. Saletore, M. A. Ph., D. of the same College. The former told me that the tradition known to him pertained to the 16th century while the latter informed me that the date for Vādirāja in the lists published by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar was definitely wrong. I thereupon asked Dr. Saletore to state his evidence on the strength of which he considered Bhandarkar's date A. D. 1331 for Vādirāja's death as definitely wrong. He was kind enough to send me a note recording epigraphic evidence in support of the date A. D. 1571 for Vādirājatīrtha and I have great pleasure in reproducing it here in extenso :—

“ Vādirāja of Udipi —

Vādirāja Svāmi's date can be determined from the following stone inscription found in the Kantanahalli grāma, Soraba Hobli in front of the Venkaṭarama temple. It relates the following :

That when the *Rāja-paramēśvara* Tirumala Rāya Mahārāja was on the throne in his residence at Penugonda, and Keladi Sadāśiva Rāya Nāyaka's (Agent) Rāma Rāja Nāyaka (was over the Banavase Twelve Thousand), Rāma Rāja Nāyaka made to Kṛṣṇadeva of Udipi, to the *parama-hansa* Vādirāja-tīrtha-śrīpāda and to Raghunidhi-tīrtha-śrīpāda, the grant of an *argahāra* with a stone

¹ The unreliability of these lists has been made clear by Prof. B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma of Annamalai University in Nov. 1935 issue of the Anna. Univ. Journal, pp. 96-118. According to him the dates of accession and demise of Madhvācārya and his first five successors are as follows :—

	Birth	Exit
Śrī Madhvācārya	A. D. 1238	1317 A. D.
1. Padmanābhatīrtha	1318 (accession)	1324
2. Narahari Tīrtha	1324 „	1333
3. Mādhava Tīrtha	1333 „	1350
4. Akṣobhya Tīrtha	1350 „	1365
5. Jayatīrtha	1365 „	1388

śāsana as follows (details given) on the date specified (which is the following:—*śri-jayābhyudaya Śālivāhana Śaka-varuṣa 1493 neya Prajōtpatya-saṁvatsarada Kārttika śuddha 15 Krutikā janana-yō-gadallu*)

(*E. C. VIII. Sb. 55, p. 10, p. 23 text.*)

The date works out to A. D. 1571, November the 1st Thursday when the *nakṣatra* was Bharani and not Kṛttikā. This was a *Pauṇrṇimā* (Swamikannu, *Indian Eph. V. p. 345.*)

From other sources we know that Vādirāja's favourite disciple was the well-known Kanaka Dāsa, the Non-Brahman (Bedar) devotee of Kṛṣṇa. Kanaka Dāsa's dates are circa 155,-1570."

In addition to the above direct inscriptional evidence for Vādirāja we find two more inscriptions¹ one of A. D. 1614 and the other A. D. 1613 in which Vādirāja and his pupil are mentioned. There are in all 40 inscriptions at Udipi, the seat of Madhva Maṭha. Two of these refer to Vādirāja and his pupil:—

"No. 231—110 of 1901—(Kanarese) On another slab built into the same wall (i. e. North wall of the Kṛṣṇa Maṭha). A record of the Vijayanagar King Vira Venkaṭa Pati (1) recording in Śaka 1536 (= A. D. 1614) (Pramādin) the grant of the village of Huvinkere by Venkatappa Nāyaka of Keladi while वेदराजतीर्थ, pupil of वादिराजतीर्थ was the priest of the temple. See Nos. 234 and 235 below. वादिराज was a man of great erudition and wrote several works."²

"No. 235—114 of 1901—(Kanarese) On another Slab built into the same wall. A record in Śaka 1535 (= A. D. 1613) Pramādin mentioning वादिराजतीर्थ and his pupil and providing for offerings."

In view of the foregoing epigraphic evidence it is difficult to believe in the accuracy of the Madhva Maṭha lists published by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar so far as exact chronology is concerned. If Vādirāja was living in A. D. 1571 as proved by the Soraba Hobli inscription mentioned above, it is perfectly natural for-

¹ Rangacharya: *Madras Inscriptions* Vol. II, pp. 870-871.

² There is a Ms of a work called रत्नसंग्रह by रघुनाथाचार्य in the India Office Library (No. 6051—Keith's Catalogue Vol. II, p. 659). It is "an anthology of the views of Vādirāja " compiled by his pupil Raghunatha.

him to refer to the transfer of the image of Vithobā to Vijaya-nagar in the line: "तुंगातीरगतोऽसि विद्वल" in the verse 13 of his तीर्थप्रबन्धकाव्य quoted above and hence there is no sort of contradiction or anachronism involved in the reference.

A question may be raised whether there was another वादिराज-तीर्थ in the Madhva line of succession distinct and separate from the वादिराजतीर्थ referred to in the inscriptions mentioned above. The Madhva lists published by Sir. R. G. Bhandarkar already alluded to by me show only one वादिराजतीर्थ and it was this वादिराज-तीर्थ that composed a commentary on the Mahābhārata. There is a Ms¹ of भारततात्पर्यनिर्णयटिप्पणी (माबप्रकाशिका) in which वादिराज gives the derivation of his own name in the following verses :—

“ प्रणम्य नृहरिं मध्वगुरुं श्रान्यान्यथामति ।
महाभारततात्पर्यनिर्णयार्थः प्रकाशयते ॥
वादी मध्वो यस्य राजा सोऽहं तस्य कृपाबलात् ।
वादिराजेन स्वशक्त्या व्रीणे वरणयामि तत् ”

We may, therefore, safely conclude that there was only one Madhva philosopher of the name वादिराजतीर्थ and that he flourished about the 2nd half of the 16th century and that the date A. D. 1339 of his death recorded in the Madhva succession lists is definitely wrong.

Prof. P. P. S. Sastri on pp. XIV-XV of his Introduction to the Sabhāparvan (Vol. III) of the Southern Recension of the Mahābhārata states that the Ms of Vādirāja's commentary used by him records the following date when the copy was made by the scribe Narasiṃha :—

“ तारुणवत्सरे चैव माघे शुक्ले च पञ्चमी ।
बुधवारं नारासिंह इदं लिखितं पुस्तकम् ॥ ”

Prof. Sastri observes that “ The earliest date for the above is 30-1-1465 A. D. and the latest date satisfying the other particulars is 25-1-1645 A. D. ”

As the date 30-1-1465 A. D. cannot satisfy all particulars mentioned by the scribe, we have to reject it and adopt the date

¹ Madras Cata. No. X, p. 3620.

15 [Annals, B. O. R. I.]

25-1-1645 A. D. which as Prof. Sastri states satisfies all particulars. This later date is perfectly in harmony with our date for Vādirāja viz. 1571 A. D. If Vādirāja wrote about 1571 it is natural to have a copy of his work in A. D. 1645.

In view of the facts recorded in this note it is difficult to accept an early date for Vādirājatīrtha as Prof. P. P. S. Sastri has done in the extract from his Introduction to one of the Mahābhārata volumes quoted by us already. In case Prof. Sastri succeeds in establishing on incontrovertible grounds an earlier date for Vādirājatīrtha I shall be very glad to know the independent evidence, if any, on the strength of which his conclusion may be based. For the present at least the inscriptional evidence recorded by me in this note compels me to reject all conjectural and other data gathered on the question so far.

REVIEWS

THE GĪTĀ RAHASYA OR SCIENCE OF KARMAYOGA,
BY B. G. Tilak, (English translation) Vol. I by B. S.
Sukthankar, M. A. LL. B. Publishers--Tilak Bros., Poona
(India) pp. 618, Price Rs. 6.

The book under review is the first volume of the English translation by Mr. B. S. Sukthankar, M. A., LL. B., of the *Gītā Rahasya*, the Secret Doctrine of the *Gītā* or as the translator puts it, the Science of Karmayoga, the magnum opus of the great patriot genius, late Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak. In spite of its early date, the *Gītā* has not yet become a document of completed history. Its influence is not waning; it is on the increase. In India countless millions derive from it comfort and joy. Even in the West, in spite of prejudice and powerful organization, the song of the lord is gaining admiration, reverence and even devotion. Feeling the pulse of the nation, the late patriot concluded that to rouse his countrymen from the slumber of inaction, it was necessary to inject into their veins the spirit of activism which he had extracted from the *Gītā* and which he had by personal experience, found most invigorating. It is with this end in view that late Mr. Tilak published his big Volume in 1915 in Marathi, the dialect spoken by millions of his countrymen. What scholarship, erudition, originality of thought and perseverance Mr. Tilak possessed will flash on the mind of a reader even by a cursory glance over the few pages of the book.

It is unnecessary to discuss in the present review the merits and demerits of the original work. Suffice it to say that the *Gītā Rahasya* has created for itself an immortal place in the hearts of the Marathi speaking people. It can be safely said that it is one of the few prose works in the Marathi language that will go down to posterity.

Since its first publication in 1915 it has passed through four editions, the first edition being sold within less than three months. Its Hindi translation has gone through seven editions. It has been translated in Gujarathi, Bengali, Kanarsee, Telgu and Tamil, i. e. practically in all the major dialects of India.

It was necessary that a work of this type be translated into English, so that it might be placed in the market of the world to be judged and appreciated by world scholars. The late Mr. Tilak greatly desired and in his life time strove to get his work translated. But as fate would have it, he neither found time to do it himself nor found anyone who could undertake to do it. It was thus an onerous charge bequeathed by him to his sons. And the work, as we have it before us, is the fulfilment of the last will of his father by the only surviving son of the late author.

Mr. Sukthankar, the translator, has taken great pains to render into English the Ethico-philosophical ideas in the original work. But the translation form has certain special difficulties of its own. The best literature in any language can never be adequately rendered in another language. The intrinsic difficulties of this method have been, from our point of view, unnecessarily increased by certain self-imposed conditions of the translator. The translator says, "In translating I have attempted to be as faithful to text as possible, as I have thought that in the case of a philosophical and technical book written by a genius like the late Lokamanya, it would be extremely wrong to take any liberty whatever with the text. The late Lokamanya, besides being a great philosopher and a great statesman, was also a master of the Marathi language and even an apparently insignificant word used by him has an immense modifying or limiting value and the omission of even a small conjunction or the translation of an 'and' or an 'or' would considerably injure the sense intended to be conveyed by the author. I have therefore not changed the text at all, but only altered the garb, or the medium of expression; for a translation is no translation, if it is not faithful. I have not even broken up long and involved sentences." We differ from the translator in this respect. A word for word translation may, to a casual reader, appear as a faithful translation. But there is every possibility that it may not be a faithful one in the true sense of the term, as it may not convey to a reader the spirit or the meaning which the original author wanted to express; thus it will frustrate the very wish of the author to be truly reproduced. The spirit is the soul of the work, the words are only the body. And we therefore believe that it is necessary to pay more attention to the spirit than to the body in the mode of its expression.

The *Gītā Rahasya*, as has been said above, started a new era in the Marathi branch of the history of the *Gītā*. Moreover, the work bristles with abstract conceptions and naughty philosophical terms. As such we believe that utmost care should have been taken to see that the translation reproduced the exact spirit of the original. But in this translation, it appears that the choice of words has been frequently unhappy. And it is possible to point out better and more appropriate English words for corresponding Marathi and Sanskrit terms. जीव for instance has been translated as 'conscious ego'. It could have been better translated as finite or individual self. The word मुक्त can certainly be translated with 'released'. But we believe it will be inappropriate to use word 'released', when by the word मुक्त (Page 19) the absolute freedom of the "Parabrahma" is to be denoted. The word क्षेत्रज्ञ on page 269 has been translated as Owner of the Body. We think Dr. Besant's translation 'knower of the field' is certainly better. The words स्तर and अस्तर on page 274 have been translated as 'matter and spirit.' We wish the author had stuck to one rendering 'mutable and immutable'.

In a translation method we think it is desirable to allow the translation to lie on the table for some days and then to revise it twice or thrice. That gives a sufficient time for the mind to dig into itself and get the most exact word. But apparently the present translator found no time to do this and hence the hasty choice.

We take this opportunity to suggest that an appendix at the end of the Vol. II be given where the technical terms and newly coined words should be explained. That will help to avoid a possible misunderstanding. For instance, Mr. Tilak translates the word *Pravṛtti Mārga* with 'Energisim.' Perhaps the author used it in a sense approaching the Aristotelian. But as used in these days it means a theory similar to the one advocated by Von Driesch and others. And until the reader comes to that page where the technical sense is explained, he is likely to be greatly misled by the associations the term energism has gathered round itself and which he must be carrying in his head. Such an appendix is absolutely necessary as the translation is meant for a reader who knows not Marathi.

Such defects are however bound to remain in a volume of over 600 pages finished within a span of hardly six months. Even as it is, we welcome the volume, as it opens a new era in the history of the work that has captured the minds of the Maharashtrians. The publishers have taken all the pains that they could to make the work as attractive as possible, by giving several opinions of great men like Babu Aravind Ghosh, Mahatma Gandhi and others about the author and the work. In a translation meant for an alien reader, the information regarding the family history of Mr. Tilak's dead son could have been safely omitted ; for it in no way helps a better understanding of the translation, though perhaps it may show why the sons could not publish the work earlier, a fact not very important to a foreigner.

The front piece is very well chosen as it is expressive of the variations in the interpretations of the *Gītā* and of the place the *Gītā Rahasya* occupies in these interpretations.

We await with keenness the second Volume of the translation.

S. V. Dandekar

THE TRADITIONAL CHRONOLOGY OF THE JAINAS
(An outline of the Political Development of India from
543 B. C. to 78 A. D.) by Shantilal Shah (Verlag von W.
Kohlhammer Stuttgart 1935)

This small book covering 109 (XII + 97) pages and having a very nice get-up forms the 9th number (Heft) of the Series " Bonner Orientalistische Studien " herausgegeben von P. Kahle und W. Kirfel. As stated by Mr. Shah in his preface, his aim in writing this book is " not alone to fix the death-year of Buddha or Mahāvira or the coronation-dates of Candragupta and Aśoka, nor to authenticate the Jaina traditional account, but also to reconstruct the chronology of the whole history of Northern India from Ajātasatru to Kaṇiṣka ".

This aim is certainly ambitious and laudable as well, but its achievement is by no means an easy task as it requires collecting, reshuffling and evaluating in a dispassionate way, various data pertaining to legendary accounts and anecdotes, coins and inscriptions as well as traditions and several historical records. Mr. Shah has no doubt taken much trouble to fulfil the aim ; but, as all the materials sufficient for the reconstruction of the chronology of the entire History of Northern India are not still available, it should not be a matter of surprise to him, if his attempt, however praiseworthy it may be is not looked upon as final. Moreover, there is always room for honest difference of opinion in the field of true research and sound scholarship.

An ardent student of history cannot afford to belittle, much less to entirely ignore, the value of a genuine study of the legendary accounts. So it is quite consistent when we find Mr. Shah making full use of the Jaina traditional account which being resourceful can lend a helping hand in solving some of the vexed questions of Indian History. It is in the fitness of things that he has devoted one whole chapter out of four, to the history of the Jaina church of ancient days.

His zest for investigation goes so far as to make him criticize the views and writings of various veteran scholars. For instance,

while agreeing with Prof. Jacobi regarding the identification of Kāśāśoka and Kākavarṇa, he differs from him when the latter doubts the authenticity of some of the Jaina chronological gāthās, and that he boldly points out Prof. Jacobi's mistake regarding the meaning of the word "Yugapradhāna". He has not even spared an ancient Sūri and a polygrapher like Hemacandra. For, he observes that there are many inconsistencies in the whole account given by him in the 8th and 9th cantos of his work *Parīśiṣṭaparvan*. Of course, he remarks in the course of his criticism that Hemacandra alone is not responsible for this, and that "he has been merely a prey of the popular stories current in his times".

On the whole Mr. Shah's book provides ample material for further study in the field of Indian chronology in general and Jaina chronology in particular. I may *en passant* note below one or two mistakes--discrepancies that I have noticed during a cursory perusal of this book, with the hope that they may be removed in the subsequent edition of this book and thus enhance the value that can be attached to it owing to its exhaustive contents, index and lucid treatment.

It is a sad mistake to attribute the authorship of *Prabhāvakacaritra* to Pradyumna Sūri who has corrected it, when the real author is Prabhācandra Sūri.¹ As regards the Index an entry about Pradyumna Sūri is at present wanting, and one more reference to *Prabhāvakacaritra* on p. 73 is left out.

In the end, while congratulating the publishers for this handy work they have thus provided to an ordinary reader, I may draw Mr. Shah's attention and that of the reader, too, to the following contributions connected with the chronology and some other problems pertaining to Maurya dynasty :—

(1) *Candragupta Maurya* by P. L. Bhargava, M. A., Shastri.

(2) "Some Problems of Early Maurya History and Chronology" by Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri, M. A., Ph. D., published in "*Indian Culture*," vol. II, No. 3, January 1936 (pp. 557-564).

H. R. Kapadia.

¹ See Descriptive Catalogue of Jain Manuscripts Vol. XIX.

VOL. XVII]

[PART III

**Annals of the
Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute,
Volume XVII
1935-36**

EDITED BY


A. B. GAJENDRAGADKAR, M. A.,

Professor of Sanskrit, Elphinstone College, Bombay

AND

V. G. PARANJPE, M. A., LL. B., D. Litt.

Professor of Sanskrit, Fergusson College, Poona



Printed and published by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, M. A., Ph. D., at the
Bhandarkar Institute Press, Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute, Poona No. 4.

POONA

1936

CONTENTS
VOLUME XVII, PART III
(31-8-36)

ARTICLES	PAGES
1 Countries and Peoples of India (Epic and Pauranic Sources) by Dr. Bimala Churn Law, M. A., B. L., Ph. D. ...	217-242
2 The Poet Bhānukara by Dr. Har Dutt Sharma, M. A., Ph. D. ...	243-258
3 Some Observations on the Figures of Speech in the R̥gveda by Abel Bergaigne (Translated into English by A. Venkatasubbiah) ...	259-288
4 A Note on Kṣa and Jñā by Prof. H. R. Kapadia, M. A. ...	289-296
MISCELLANEA	
5 Bhānudatta and Bhānukara by Dr. S. K. De, M. A., D. Litt. ...	297-298
REVIEWS	
6 Dharma and Society by Dr. G. H. Mees, M. A., LL. D., published by N. V. Servire - the Hague and Luzac & Co., London, W. C. I., pp. XV + 206 : Price, cloth 12/6 s. and paper 9/6 s. reviewed by P. V. Kane, M. A., LL. M. ...	299-304
7 The Padyāvali edited by Sushil Kumar De of the University of Dacca, Dacca University Oriental Publications Series, No. 3. Published by the University of Dacca, 1934, pp. i-exliv, 1-296 reviewed by Dr. Har Dutt Sharma, M. A., Ph. D. ...	305-308
8 Eine indo-arische Metaphysik des Kampfes und der Tat. Die Bhagavadgītā in neuer Sicht J. W. Hauer. Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 1934. Price RM 3. pp. I-VII. 1-76, reviewed by Dr. Har Dutt Sharma, M. A., Ph. D. ...	309-310

- 9 The Jasmine Garland (Kundamālā) Translated into English by A. C. Woolner, C. I. E., M. A. (Oxon), Hon. D. Litt. (Panjab), F. A. S. B., Officier D' Académie Francaise ; Principal, Oriental College, Lahore ; Vice-Chancellor of the University of the Panjab, Panjab University Oriental Publications, No. 27. Oxford University Press, London. 1935. pp. V-XIV ; 1-50. Price 6 shillings, reviewed by Dr. Har Dutt Sharma, M. A., Ph. D. ... 311-315
- 10 हिंदुस्थानांतील आमच्या ठिकठिकाणच्या सफरी—सफर पहिली सन १९०९—by Raja Raghunathrao Shankarrao Pandit, Pant Sachiv ; Published by the Private Secretary to the Raja Saheb of Bhore, Bhore, pp 124, reviewed by P. K. Gode, M. A. ... 316-317
- 11 Travancore A Guide book for the visitors, by Emily Gilchrist Hatch, reviewed by D. V. Potdar, B. A. ... 318
-

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

Vol. XVII]

APRIL 1936

[PART III

COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES OF INDIA

(Epic and Pauranic Sources)

BY

Dr. BIMALA CHURN LAW, M. A. , B. L. , Ph. D.

BHĀRATAVARṢA AND ITS VARIOUS DIVISIONS

The Jambudvīpa, according to Puranic authors, was originally divided into seven varṣas, namely Ilāvṛta or Meru varṣa, Rāmyaka or Rāmaṇaka (Matsya, 113, 61; Mbh. VI, 8. 2.) or Nīla-varṣa (Brahmāṇḍa, 34, 46), Hiraṇmaya or Śvetavarṣa (Brahmāṇḍa, 34, 46; Agni 107. 7), Uttarakuru or Śṛṅgavad-(Brḍa, 34. 47) or Airāvata-varṣa (Mbh. VI, 6. 37), Bhārata or Himāva (Brḍa, 34. 44, 53) or Haimavata (Brḍa, 35. 30, Matsya, 113. 28) or Ajanābha (Ind. Ant. 1899. p. 1), Kimpuruṣa or Hemakūṭa-varṣa (Brḍa, 34. 44) or Haimavata-varṣa (Mbh. VI, 6. 7.) or Kinnarakhaṇḍa (Ain-i-Akbari, III, pp. 30. 31), and Hariavarṣa or Niṣadha-varṣa (Brḍa, 34. 45). Two other varṣas, namely, Bhadrāśva or Mālyavad-varṣa and Ketumāla or Gandhmādana-varṣa (Brḍa, 34. 47, 48), were later on added to the original seven, thus bringing the total number of varṣas to nine (for sapta-varṣāṇi, see Matsya, 113-14; Brḍa, 35. 24; ibid, 28, Mbh. VI. 6. 53; for nava-varṣāṇi, see, Matsya, 114, 85; Brḍa, 34, 48; ibid, 35, 7; Nilakanṭha's Com. on Mbh. VI. 6. 37). Of these varṣas Bhāratavarṣa lay most to the South. It was separated from the Kimpuruṣa by the Himavat,

and had the shape of a bow (Matsya, 113. 32; Br̥ḍa, 35. 33; Mbh. VI. 6. 38). It lay between the Himavat to the north and the sea to the south (Vāyu, 45. 75-76; Viṣṇu, II. 3. 1.)¹

The name Bhāratavarṣa is said to have been derived from King Bharata, a descendant of Priyavrata, son of Manu Svayambhava.²

Bhāratavarṣa, according to Puranic Cosmology, was divided into *nava khaṇḍas* or nine divisions. According to *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* they are:

Indradvīpaḥ Kaśerumāns-Tāmraparṇo Gabhastimān
Nāgadvīpastathā Saumyo Gāndharvvo Vārunastathā
Ayaṁ tu navamasteṣāṁ dvīpaḥ sāgarasaṁvṛtaḥ³
Yojanānāṁ sahasraṁ vai dvīpo yaṁ dakṣiṇottarāt
Brāhmaṇāḥ Kṣatriyā Vaiśyāḥ Śūdrāścāntaḥsthitā dvija⁴

These nine 'bhedas' or 'khaṇḍas' of Bhāratavarṣa are mentioned also in the famous astronomical work, the Siddhānta Śīromaṇi (III. 41) of the celebrated astronomer Bhāskarācārya, as well as in the majority of the Purāṇas. The Vāmana and the Garuḍa Purāṇas however replace Saumya and Gāndharva by Kātāha and Simhala. The ninth dvīpa which is described as 'encircled by seas, extending over thousand yojanas from north to south,'⁵ with Kirātas at the eastern extreme and Yavanas at the western and Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras residing between', is not mentioned by name in the majority of the Purāṇas. The name is supplied by the Vāmana Purāṇa as Kumāra (XIII. ii) and by the Kumārika Khaṇḍam of the Skanda Purāṇa

¹ For the historical value and otherwise of the different Pauranic Varṣas, see, Ray Chaudhuri, *Studies in Indian Antiquities*, pp. 61-80.

² Br̥ḍa, 34. 55; Bhāga, XI, 2. 15 ff.

³ The *Nagarasaṁvṛtaḥ* of Alberuni is obviously a copyist's mistake (Indica; I, 295).

⁴ Mārka. P. 57.

⁵ According to the Skanda Purāṇa, Kumārika Khaṇḍa extended from only the Mahendra mountain to the Pāriyātra (Kumārika Khaṇḍa, 39. 113); according to the Garuḍa Purāṇa, however, it was bounded on the east by the Kirātas, on the west by the Yavanas, on the south by the Āndhras and on the north by the Turuṣkas (55. 6).

as Kumārika (39.69). The Kāvya-nīmāṃsā of Rājasekhara also gives the name of the ninth dvīpa as Kumārī (Deśa-vibhāga, p. 92). The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa along with other Purāṇas describe the nine dvīpas as 'separated by seas and as being mutually inaccessible' (Samudrāntarītā jñeyāste tvagamyāḥ parasparam, Mār. 575). But Bhāratavarṣa, as we now know it, is not separated by seas within itself, nor are its component parts "mutually inaccessible"; Bhāratavarṣa is not thus our India of present geographical area. That Bhāratavarṣa connoted a much larger area than India proper will be evident from the fact that only one of its islands, the ninth, stands for India proper. The 'ninth dvīpa' i. e., the Kumārī or Kumārika dvīpa is described to be surrounded by sea and to have been inhabited by the Kirātas and the eastern extreme and Yavanas at the western with Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras thrown within. The Kumārī dvīpa thus seems to be identical with India proper; and in its account the Paurāṇic authors seem to describe a condition of India as in about the first century A. D., when Ptolemy locates the Kirrhadia, doubtless identical with the Kirātas, in the eastern region (Cf. Majumdar's edition of Ptolemy. p. 219) and the inscriptions of Aśoka place the Yonas or Yavanas along with the Kambojas and Gāndhāras.¹ Bhāratavarṣa thus denoted a much larger area than India proper.²

As to the identifications of eight other dvīpas there is much scope for speculation, and hence a great deal of disagreement among scholars. Thus Alberuni identifies Indradvīpa with Madhyadeśa, i. e., the middle country (Indica I. p. 296) while Abul Fazl in his *Ain-i-Akbari* places it between Laṅkā and Mahendra hills (III, p. 31) which somewhat agrees with the location of the dvīpa as described in Skandapurāṇa.

¹ Cf. also the *Mahāvamsa*, Geiger's trans. p. 85, p. 194, n; Cf. also the invasion of the Indo-Greeks in the time of the Śuṅgas, and later of the Bactrian Greeks.

² Fargiter rightly observes that the description of Kumārī dvīpa does not fully accord with the geographical position of India, for India proper "is not surrounded by the sea, but bounded by it only on the east, south and west, and only partially so on the east and west for verse 8 places the Kirātas and Yavanas respectively." Mār. p. 284 n.

Surendranath Majumdar Sastri identifies it with Burma. The next dvīpa, Kaserumat, is placed by Alberuni to the east of Madhyadeśa, and between Mahendra and Sukti hills by Abul Fazl.

Majumdar identifies it with the Malay Peninsula. The third dvīpa, Tāmravarṇa or (Tāmraparṇa or Tāmraparṇī) is placed in the south-east by Alberuni and between Sukti and Malaya by Abul Fazl. It is probably identifiable with the region drained by the river Tāmraparṇī in the extreme South. The dvīpa is also identifiable with Ceylon which the Greek Geographers knew as Taprobane, and is referred to in the inscriptions of Aśoka as Tam-bapanni. Gabhastimat, according to Abul Fazl, lay between the Rkṣa and the Malaya, and according to Alberuni, to the south of the Madhyadeśa. According to Smith Nāgadvīpa seems to be identical with the Jaffna Peninsula of Ceylon (Early History of India, 4th Edn. p. 491) Saumya has not been identified, but Katāha which is the substitute reading in the Vāmana Purāṇa has been rightly identified with Kedah in the Malaya Peninsula. Gāndharva is placed by Alberuni to the north-west of the Madhyadeśa; it is doubtless identical with the well-known and very ancient region of Gandhāra. Garuḍa Purāṇa reads Simpala instead which is Ceylon. Varuṇa, the eighth dvīpa, is placed by Abul Fazl between the Sahya and the Vindhya.

Perhaps older and certainly more accurate than the tradition of the Pauranic *Navakhaṇḍa* is the division of Bhāratavarṣa into nine bhedas by the celebrated astronomers Parāśara and Varāhamihira.¹ These astronomers and astrologers conceived the shape of India as that of a tortoise (kūrma) lying outspread; they therefore describe the country as *Kūrma-cakra*. Each of the nine *bhedas* is called a *varga* by Varāha; Bhāratavarṣa is thus divided into nine parts conforming to the nine of the ten points of the compass, e. g., the central, eastern, southern, western, northern, south-eastern or *Agneya*, south-western or *Nairṭa* north-western of *Vāyava* and north-eastern *Aśāna*. Pāñcāla was the main district in the central division, Magadha in the eastern, Kulinda in the north-eastern, Madra in the northern,

¹ Varāhamihira is supposed to have adopted the tradition earlier recorded by Parāśara in his *Parāśaratantra*. See, Kern's edn. of *Bṛhatsamhitā* of Varāha, p. 32.

Harahaura (or Hara Huṇa) in the north-western, Sindhu in the western, Ānarta in the south-western, Avanta in the southern, and Kalinga in the south-eastern (Bṛhat Saṃh, Ch. XIV. 32, 33). But when Varāha comes to his details, he assigns Sindhu and Sauvīra in the south-western division (Nairṭa) along with Pahlava and Kamboja and evidently Ānarta also (Ibid, XIV. 17). "This mistake is certainly as old as the eleventh century, as Abu Rihān has preserved the names of Varāha's abstract in the same order as they now stand in the *Bṛhat Saṃhitā* (Reinaud, *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, pp. 116, 117 cf. no. II, map, fig. 3). These details are also supported by the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, which assigns both Sindhu-Sauvīra and Ānarta to the south-west."¹

But the most accurate from the geographical point of view is the description of our country divided into five and seven regions as given in the *Purāṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. The division of India into five regions is however as old as the *Atharva-veda* (XIX. 17. 1-9) and the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (VIII. 14), and was adopted by later Brahmanical and Buddhist authorities.¹ Thus Smṛti writers like Baudhāyana seem to suggest a five-fold division while Rājaśekhara in his *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* actually adopts it. Buddhist writers like Yuan Chwang and authors of earlier texts also follow the same division. The *Mahābhārata* also describes five divisions in detail, the central or Madhyadeśa, the eastern, southern, western and northern and at least three, the *Matsya*, *Vāyu* and *Viṣṇu purāṇas*, agree with it. According to the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, Madhyadeśa was occupied by the Kurus and Pañcālas, the east by the people of Kāmarūpa, the south by the Puṇḍras, Kalingas and Magadhas, the west by the Saurāṣṭras, Śūras, Ābhīras, Arbudas, Kārūṣas, Mālavas, Sauvīras and Saindhavas, and the north (?) by the Hūṇas, Śālvas, the people of Sākala, Ambaṣṭhas, Pārasikas, Rāmas etc. (Wilson's *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, Vol. II. Bk. II. 3 p. 132; there is, however no mention of the northern division in the text but it is nevertheless evident).² The *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* list of countries is very meagre; the *Mahābhārata* has a much longer catalogue, but it is without any arrangement; so also in the *Padmapurāṇa*.

¹ Cunningham's *Geography*, Majumdar's Edn., p. 7 and note.

² See, Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, Intro. p. xixff.

The longest list of countries and peoples of India is however, contained in the *Mārkaṇḍeya*, the *Brahmaṇḍa* and the *Vāyu*. Both the *Mārkaṇḍeya* and the *Brahmaṇḍa* refer to the territorial divisions of India (*Kumārīdvīpa*) as numbering seven, the latter expressly stating that in ancient times *Bhāratavarṣa* was divided into seven regions (*Sapta Khaṇḍam*).¹ But this division into seven regions is not anything fundamentally different from the division into five which is adopted by the majority of the *Purāṇas* and the *Mahābhārata*. This will be evident from the list of the divisions which are as follows: the *Madhyadeśa*, the *Udīcya* or north, the *Prācya* or east, *Dakṣiṇāpatha* or south, the *Apārānta* or west, the *Vindhya* region and the *Himālayan* region (*Parvataśreyiṇaḥ*).

The *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* has also a second classification, apart from this seven, into nine, adopted certainly from the astronomical and astrological work of *Varāhamihira* and *Parāśara*. There India is described as resting on *Viṣṇu* in the form of a tortoise looking eastward; the various countries and peoples of *Bhāratavarṣa* are distributed accordingly over the several parts of his body, together with corresponding lunar constellations. The majority of the names of countries and peoples is very much the same as we find in the *Nadyādivarṇanā* section of the same *purāṇa*, but there is also quite a good lot of names that are entirely new and original.

It has already been pointed out that geographically speaking the division of our country into seven regions is more accurate and more in accord with reality. We, therefore, propose to follow the account as given in the *nadyādi varṇanā* section (Ch. 57) and supplement it by names of peoples and countries as mentioned in the astronomical section (Ch. 58). The *Brahmaṇḍa* and the *Vāyu Purāṇas*, and as a matter of fact other *Purāṇas* also, give us nothing more than what is there in these two sections of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*.

SHAPE OF INDIA

It has already been pointed out that according to the *Kūrmaniveśa* section (i. e. astronomical) of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* as

¹ *Brahmaṇḍa*, 36, 64.

well as the works of our early astronomical authors the shape of India was like that of a tortoise "lying outspread and facing eastwards." This conception ignores the extreme southern region of the country. From the geographical standpoint, a sober account is given in a number of Purāṇas as well as in the Mahābhārata which describe India as having the shape of a bow (Matsya, 113. 32; Br̥da, 35. 33. Mbh. VI, 6. 38). Nilakanṭha, the celebrated Commentator of the Mahābhārata, confirms the bow-like description of the country (Commy. on the Mbh. VI, 6. 3-5), but he also speaks of Bhāratavarṣa as being triangular in shape (Ibid. VI, 6. 3-5) which is certainly a better description. The most accurate description, however, seems to be the one as given in the *nadyādi varṇanā* section of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa. India according to this conception, is "constituted with a four-fold conformation. On its south and west and east is the great ocean; the Himavat range stretches along on its north, like the string of a bow."¹

MADHYA-DEŚA OR CENTRAL REGION²

Matsyāśvakūṭāḥ Kulyāśca Kuntalāḥ Kāśi Kośalāḥ
Atharvāśca Kalingāśca Malakāśca Vṛkaḥ saha
Madhyadeśyā Janāpadāḥ prāyaśo'mī prakīrtitāḥ ||
Sahyasya c'ottare yāstu yatra Godāvari nadī |
Pṛthivyāmapī Kṛtsnāyām sa pradeśo manoramah ||
Govardhanam puram ramyam Bhārgavasya mahātmanah |
(Mārka. P. 57. 32-35).

Matsya—According to the Mahābhārata (Sabhā P. XXX, 1105-6) the Matsya country of the Matsya people was situated south or south-west of Indraprastha, and west of Sūrasena (Virāṭa P. V, 141-45). According to Manu it was within the limits of

¹ Mārka. P. 57. 59 Pargiter's Tr. p. 347. According to Cunningham, the Mahābhārata has another description of the shape of the country, that of an equilateral triangle "which was divided into four smaller equal triangles. The apex of the triangle is Cape Comorin, and the base is formed by the line of the Himālaya mountains." *Anc. Geo. of India*, Majumdar's Edn. p. 5.

For other descriptions of the shape of India, see, *ibid*, pp. 1-13; *Camb. Hist. of India*, I, pp. 400-402; Ray Chaudhuri, *Studies in Indian Antiquities*, pp. 84-86; Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, Intro., p. xixff.

² For the boundaries of Madhyadeśa see Law, *Ibid*, pp. 1-2.

Brahmaṛśideśa (Manu, II, 19). The Mahābhārata mentions (Śalya P. XXXVI, 1973-76) Upaplavya or Upaplava, a city situated at a distance of two days' journey by chariot from Hastināpura, as its capital (Udyoga P. LXXXIII 3910-17: LXXXV. 3040). It is difficult to ascertain if Upaplavya was the same as Vairāṭa or Virāṭanagara which is also said to have been the capital city of the Matsya. Virāṭanagara was so called because it was the capital of Virāṭa, king of the Matsyas. According to Buddhist tradition it was one of the sixteen Mahājanapadas. The Matsya country comprised the modern territory of Jaipur including the whole of the present territory of Alwar with a portion of Bharatpur.

The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Vatsas instead of Matsyas (XLV. 110). The kingdom of the Vamsas or Vatsas is mentioned in Buddhist texts as one of the sixteen Mahājanapadas. According to the Mahābhārata Vatsa or Vatsya kingdom was situated to the east of Indraprastha (Sabhā P. XXIX. 1084); its king Vatsa was a grandson of king Divodāsa of Benares (Hari V. XXIX. 1587, 1597). The capital of the Vatsa country was Kausāmbī identical with modern Kosam near Allahabad.¹

Aśvakūṭas--Such as a tribe or country is unknown: it is obviously a misreading, for the Vāyu Purāṇa reads Kisaṣas, Kisaṣtas or Kisadyas instead (XLV. 110), and the Matsya reads Kirātas (CXIII 35). But we have otherwise no information of the location of the Kirātas in the Madhyadeśa; epic and pauranic tradition places them in the eastern region as we shall see later on; evidently the Kirātas are out of place here.

Kulyas--No such tribe or country is known; but it may be possible that they were the same people as the Kulutas, a republican community, who are mentioned in inscriptions of about the 1st century A. D. The Kulutas dwelt in the Punjab along with such tribes as the Mālavas, Yaudheyas, Arjunāyanas, Udumbaras, Kunindas etc.

Kuntalas--The Bhīṣma Parva (IX, 347, 359, and 367) of the Mahābhārata has some references to this tribe. The tribe referred to in verse 347 of the Bhīṣma Parva is probably the

¹ Law, Geo. E. B., pp. 16-17.

one referred to here in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa. The Kuntalas evidently occupied a country contiguous to Kāśī and Kosala where Cunningham found a region called Kuntala near Chunar. The tribe mentioned in verse 359 seems to have been a western people as they are mentioned along with peoples residing in the western region. The third tribe mentioned in verse 367 was the well-known Kuntala people of the South who played an important rôle in the history of the Deccan.

Kāśī—Celebrated as one of the oldest janapadas Kāśī finds mention in each and every ancient work of importance, Brahmanical or Buddhist. It is the ancient Vārāṇasī. According to the Rāmāyaṇa (Ādi. K. XII. 20) Kāśī was a kingdom while Prayāga and the regions around it were still a forest (Cf. Kalakāvana). The Harivaṃśa refers to its early vicissitudes (XXIX and XXXII) while the Udyoga Parva of the Mahābhārata alludes to Kṛṣṇa's repeated burning of city. (XLVII. 1883).

Kośala—Evidently Uttara Kośala or northern Kośala is meant for another Kośala which was called Dakṣiṇa Kośala or Mahā-Kośala is mentioned later on in verse 54 of Chap. 57 of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa. According to epic tradition, Ayodhyā on the Sarayū seems to have been the earliest capital, but later on, in Buddhist times Ayodhyā sank to the level of an unimportant city but Sāketa and Sāvasthī were two of the six important cities of India.¹

Atharvas and Arkalīṅgas—These two names are evidently misreadings, and it is difficult to find out what the correct form had been. The Vāyu Purāṇa reads *atha pārśve tilaṅgāśca* instead of *Atharvāśca Kālīṅgāśca*, while the Matsya reads *Atharvāśca Kālīṅgāśca*. All these readings are improbable. Tilāṅgas are well-known as a southern people, identical with the Trikalīṅgas, and mentioned in Chap. 58 verse 28 of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa in connection with the southern people. Avantas and Kālīṅgas are also well-known peoples but they are not known to have been located in the Madhyadeśa. In fact the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa refers to the Avantas as a Vindhyan tribe (ch. 57; verses 52 and 55)

¹ Law, Geo. E. B., pp. 4-6.

² [Annals, B. O. R. I.]

and to the Kalingas once as a northern (Ibid; V. 37) and at another time as a southern tribe (Ibid, V. 46). The reference to the Kalingas as a northern tribe is certainly erroneous.

Malakas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Magadhas instead and the Matsya reads Mūkas. Both are misreadings, for the Magadhas are mentioned as an eastern people in verse 44 of Chap. 57 of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa. Pargiter suggests (Mār. P. p. 309) that the reading should be Malajas. The Malajas "are mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma Parva, IX, 357) and Rāmāyaṇa (Ādi K. XXVII, 16-23) and from the course described in the latter poem as taken by Viśvāmitra and Rāma, it appears they were neighbours of the Kārūṣas and occupied the district of Shahabad, west of the Sone.....(ibid, 8-16).

Vṛkas—This tribe is similarly referred to in the Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma P. LI. 2106); but the Matsya Purāṇa reads Andhakas instead. The Andhakas, were very intimately associated with the Yādavas, and are often referred to in the Mahābhārata (Udyoga P. LXXXV, 304; Harivaṃśa, XXXV. 1907-8; ibid, XXXIX, 2041 etc.) but they are known to have been located in western India or Aparānta. A more correct reading appears to be Vṛṣṇikas.

The Mārkaṇḍeya list of peoples and countries of Madhyadeśa does not seem to be complete; for, the Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas enumerate few countries more (Vāyu, XLV. 109-110; Matsya, CXIII. 35, 36), and the Mahābhārata seems to confirm it (Bhīṣma P. IX. 346-7). These countries and peoples are as follows: the Kurus, Pañcālas, Śālvas, Jāṅgalas, Śūrasenas, Bhadrakas, Boddhas and the lords of Śatapatha. The Matsya Purāṇa, however, gives the last two names as Bāhyas and Paṭaccaras.

Kurus—The land of the Kurus was well-known as one of the sixteen mahājanapadas in the days of the Buddha; many a Buddhist legend is associated with the Kurus and their country.¹ They are also very intimately connected with epic tradition; indeed the Mahābhārata grew up with the Kuru people and their country as its background. The ancient Kuru country may be said to have comprised the Kurukṣetra or Thānesvar. The region included Sonapat, Amin, Karnal and Pānīpat, and was

¹ Law, Geo. E. B., pp. 17-18.

situated between the Sarasvatī on the north and Dr̥ṣadvatī on the south.

According to Pargiter the Kurus occupied the country "from the Sivis and sub-Himālayan tribes on the north to Matsya, Sūrasena and South Pañcālā on the South, and between north Pañcālā on the east and Marubhūmi (the Rajputana desert) on the west. Their territory appears to have been divided into three parts, Kurukṣetra, the Kurus and the Kurujāngala (Ādi P. CIX. 4337-40). Kurukṣetra, 'the cultivated land of the Kurus' comprised the whole tract on the west of the Jumna and included the sacred region between the Sarasvatī and Dr̥ṣadvatī (Van P. LXXXIII. 5071-78 and 7073-76; Rāmāyaṇa, Ayodhyā K. LXX. 12; Megha D. I. 49-50)... Kuru-jāngala, 'the waste land of the Kurus' was the eastern part of their territory and appears to have comprised the tract between the Ganges and North Pañcālā (Rām. Ayodhyā K. LXXII; Mbh. Sabhā P. XIX. 793-94). The middle region between the Ganges and Jumna seems to have been called simply the Kuru's country. The capital was Gajapur Hastināpura; and Khāṇḍavaprastha or Indraprastha, the modern Delhi, was a second capital founded by the Pāṇḍavas (Ādi P., CCVII, 7568-94) " ¹

Pañcālas — According to Buddhist tradition Pañcālā had two divisions: "Uttara Pañcālā and Dakṣiṇa Pañcālā. Mahābhārata also refers to these two divisions of the country the capital of Uttara Pañcālā was Ahicchatra or Chatravatī (identical with modern Ramnagar in the Bareilly district), while southern Pañcālā had its capital at Kāmpilya (Mbh. 138. 73-74), identical with modern Kāmpil in the Farokhabad district. According to Buddhist tradition as contained in the Divyāvadāna, the capital of Uttara Pañcālā was Hastināpura while according to the Jātakas Kapillanagara was the capital. ²

Pañcālā was originally the country north and west of Delhi from the foot of the Himālayas to the river Chambal, but it was

¹ Pargiter, Mār. P. pp. 354-355.

² Law, Geo. E. B., pp. 18-19.

divided into north and south Pañcāla, separated by the Ganges. It roughly corresponds to modern Budaon, Furrukhabad and the adjoining districts of the U. P.

Śālvas -- The Śālvas as a people are often mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*; in the *Vanaparva* they are also mentioned as *Śālveyas* (CCLXIII, 15576-82). They lived not very far from the Kurus and Trigarttas (*Virāṭa* P. I, 11-12; *ibid*, XXX). Satya-vān was a Śālva prince (*Vana* P. CCXCII); the story of Kṛṣṇa's conquest of the Śālva country points to the fact that they were located somewhere contiguously with the Yādavas (*Vana* p. XIV-XXII; *Udyoga* p. XLVII. 1886; *Droṇa* p. XI. 395). Pargiter therefore thinks that the Śālva country was situated 'along the western side of the Aravalli hills.'

Jāṅgalas -- Pargiter's suggestion that the Jāṅgalas are the same as the people of Kurujāṅgalas is evidently correct, since they are mentioned along with the Kurus and contiguous tribes (see above), and there are no other people of this name mentioned in ancient texts or inscriptions.

Sūrasenas -- Sūrasena lay not far from the country of the Kurus and the Matsyas. In fact, it was located immediately to the south of the Kuru country and to the east of the Matsya country. Sūrasena became famous in epic and puranic literature because of its connection with Kṛṣṇa and the Yādava tribe. The country had its capital at Mathurā which stood on the Jamuna. The epic and puranic story of Kāṁsa's attempt to make himself a tyrant at Mathurā by overpowering the Yādavas, and his consequent death at the hands of Kṛṣṇa is not only referred to by Patañjali but also by the Jātakas. The early Greek writers knew Sūrasena as Sourasendi¹. Presumably the Sūrasenas belonged to the Yādava tribe, for Mathurā, the capital of the Sūrasenas, is specially called the capital of the Yādavas and the kings ruling at Mathurā also belong to that tribe (*Harivamśa*, LVII, 3180-93; LXXIX. 4124-34, etc.).

Bhadrakaras -- The location of the Bhadrakaras is difficult to determine as well as their identity; doubtless they are the same

¹ See Geo. E. B. by Law, pp. 20-21.

as the Bhadrakāras (Sabhā P. XIII, 590) and the Bhadras (Vana P. CCLIII, 15256) of the Mahābhārata. The people may be said to have had their habitat near about the Kurus, the Matsyas and the Sūrasenas. It is not improbable that the Uttamabhadras known in historical times as a republican tribe were a section of the epic and pauranic Bhadrakas or Bhadras.

Bodhas—The Bodhas are mentioned also in the Mahābhārata (Sabhā P. XIII, 590; Bhīṣma P. IX, 347), and perhaps also in the Rāmāyaṇa as Bodhis (Ayodhyā K. LXX. 15). These people were probably located somewhere in the eastern districts of the Punjab.

The reading Bāhyas of the Matsya purāṇa seems to be erroneous, since the name is not met with elsewhere, if of course, they are not equated with the Bāhikas.

Satapatha—This is unintelligible, and obviously erroneous. Paṭaccara is indeed a better reading, for a people of this name is also mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Sabhā P. XIII, 590-91; XXX, 1108; Virāṭa P. I, 11-12, etc.).

After the catalogue of countries and peoples in the Madhyadeśa the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa has the following passage:

Sahyasya c'ottare yāstu yatra Godāvarī nadi ।

Prthivyāmapi Kṛtsnāyān sa pradeśo manoramah ॥

Govardhṇam puram ramaṇ Bhārgavasya mahātmanah ।

The Vāyu purāṇa, however, reads Sahyasya c'ottarārdhe tu instead of Sahyasya c'ottare yāstu; the former indeed makes a better reading, for any people who are said to have been located just to the north of the Sahya mountains cannot be said to be within Madhyadeśa. According to the reading as given in the Vāyu and also in the Matsya (*Sahyasyānantare c'aite*) the people mentioned in this passage, i. e. the Bhārgavas, were located along the (northern half of the) Sahya mountains and the region in which the Godāvarī flows. "This region and the country west of it on the other side of these mountains and the tract northwards to the Narmadā", Pargiter points out, "are connected in many a story with Bhṛgu, his son Cyavana and his descendants (Mbh. Ādi P. CLXXVIII, 6802-10; Vana P. CXXI, CXXI, LXXXIX. 8364-65, CXV. 10150-2, etc.). The Bhārgavas were

however, a numerous race and spread into other regions: they are also mentioned as one of the eastern peoples" (Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, Ch. LVII, 43). The Bhārgavas were probably identical with the Bhaggas of the Buddhist texts who were located at Sumsumāragiri in the Majjhimaśāla.¹

APARĀNTA & UDĪCYA or NORTHWESTERN AND THE NORTHERN COUNTRIES

Vāhlikā Vāṭadhānāśca Abhīrāḥ Kālatoyakāḥ ॥
 Aparāntāśca Śūdrāśca Pallavāśca Carmakhaṇḍikāḥ ।
 Gāndhārā Yavanāścaiva Sindhu-Sauvīra-Madrakāḥ ॥
 Śatadrūyāḥ Kāliṅgāśca Pārada Hārabhūṣikāḥ ।
 Mātharā Bahubhadraśca Kaikeya Daśamālikāḥ ॥
 Kṣatriyopāniveśāśca Vaiśya-Śūdrakulāni ca ।
 Kāmbojā Daradāścaiva Barbarā Harṣavardhanāḥ ॥
 Cīnāścaiva tu Khārāśca bahulā Bāhyato narāḥ ।
 Ātreyaśca Bharadvājāḥ Puṣkalāśca Kaśerukāḥ ॥
 Lampākāḥ Śūlakarāśca Culikā Jāguḍaiḥ Saha ।
 Aupadhāścānimadrāśca Kirātānāṅca Jātayaḥ ॥
 Tāmasā Hamsamārgāśca Kāśmīrastuṅganāstathā ।
 Śūlikāḥ Kuhakāścaiva Urṇā darvāstathaiḥ ca ॥
 Ete deśā hyudīcyāstu.....

(Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, ch. 57. 35-42).

The northern peoples are the Vāhlikas, Vāṭadhānas, the Abhīras, the Kālatoyakas, the Aparāntas, the Śūdras, the Pallavas, the Carmakhaṇḍikas, the Gāndhāras, the Yavanas, the Sindhus, the Sauvīras, the Madrakas, the Śatadrūjas, the Kāliṅgas, the Pāradas, the Hārabhūṣikas, the Mātharas, the Bahubhadras, the Kaikeyas, the Daśamālikas, the settlements of the Kṣatriyas, the families of the Vaiśyas and Śūdras, the Kambojas, the Daradas, the Barbaras, the Harṣavardhanas, the Cīnas, the Kharas, and the various peoples who live outside, the Ātreyas, the Bharadvājas, the Puṣkalas, the Kaśerūkas, the Lampākas, the Śūlakāras, the Culikas, the Jāguḍas, the Aupadhas, the Animadras, the Kirātas, the Tāmasas, the Hamsamārgas, the Kāśmīras, the Tuṅganas, the Śūlikas, the Kuhakas, the Urṇas and the Darvas.

¹ Law, Geo. E. B., pp. 33, 43.

Vāhlikas—They are the same people as the *Vāhikas* or *Valhikas*. For a detailed account of this tribe readers are referred to my *Ancient Indian Tribes*, Vol. II, pp. 58-60.

Vāṭadhānas—The *Vāyu Purāṇa* reads *Vāḍhadhānas* which is evidently a mistake, for the people referred to are mentioned several times in the *Mahābhārata* under the name *Vāṭadhānas* (*Sabhā* P. I, 1826; *Udyoga* P. III, 86; *Bhīṣma* P. IX, 354; *Droṇa* P. XI, 398). The *Mahābhārata* includes the name of their king *Vāṭadhāna* under the *Krodha-vasa* group (*Ādi Parva*, LXVII. 2695-9) to which also belonged the eponymous kings of the *Vāhlikas*, *Madras* and *Sauvīras*. Evidently the *Vāṭadhānas* were connected with these peoples and were located contiguously to these tribes. The *Vāṭadhānas* were also among the peoples that assembled on the side of the *Kauravas*, and from the reference as given in the *Udyoga Parva* (XVIII, 596-601) and *Sabhā Parva* (XXXI. 1190-91) it appears that the tribe was located somewhere on the eastern side of the *Sutlej*. According to *Manu* (X. 21) a *Vāṭadhāna* was the off-spring of an outcaste brahman and a brahman woman; "but", says *Pargiter*, "that is no doubt an expression of the same arrogance which in later times stigmatised all the Punjab races as outcastes....."

Ābhiras—According to the *Mahābhārata* (*Sabhā* P., XXXI, 1192) the *Ābhiras* were classed into three divisions. One dwelt along the *Sarasvatī*, one lived by fishing and may perhaps be interpreted as having their location along the sea-coast and the third dwelling on the mountains. *Mahābhārata* mentions them several times, and the *Rāmāyaṇa* at least twice in the *Kiṣkindhyā Kāṇḍa* (XLIII. 5 and 19). For a detailed account of the tribe readers are referred to my *Ancient Indian Tribes*, Vol. II, pp. 51-54.

Kālatoyakas—The *Mahābhārata* reads *Kālaṇḍakas* instead (*Bhīṣma* P. IX, 354); but neither the *Kālatoyakas* nor the *Kālaṇḍakas* are indentifiable.

Aparāntas—The *Vāyu Purāṇa* reads *Aparītas* and *Matsya Purandharas* instead; both are evidently erroneous. The *Bhīṣma Parva* list agrees with that of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, and mention is often made of the tribe in the *Mahābhārata* as *Aparānta*

or Aparāntas (Bhīṣma P. IX. 355; Vana P. CCXVII, 7885-56; Śānti P. XLIX, 1780-82). Generally the term is applied to all the tribes living in the western region of India, but the Mārkaṇḍeya and the Bhīṣma Parva list must also be taken to signify a particular tribe. According to the astronomical list of the Mārkaṇḍeya (Chap. 58) the tribe seems to have been located north of the Sindhu-Sauvīra country.

Śūdras—In the Mahābhārata the Śūdras are almost invariably associated with the Ābhīras (Sabhā P. XXXI. 1192; Bhīṣma IX, 375; Droṇa P. XX. 798; Śālya P. XXXVIII, 2119-20); and were considered to be outside the pale of Aryanism. The Rāmāyaṇa (Kiṣ K. XLIII, 19) and some of the Purāṇas read Śūras instead which certainly is erroneous. A definite location of the tribe is provided by a śloka in the Mahābhārata which places them in western Rajputana where the Sarasvatī disappears (Śūdrābhīrān prati dveṣād yatro naṣṭā Sarasvatī, Mbh. IX, 37. 1).

The Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali to which we can assign a definite date is perhaps the earliest authority that introduces the Śūdras in Indian history (Patañjali, I, 2. 3). There the tribe is associated with the Ābhīras, a tradition which as we have seen is upheld by the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas as well (e. g., vide Viṣṇu P. by Wilson Bk. II, Chap. 3, p. 133). The Śūdras were evidently identical with the Sodrai (Σογδαι) of Greek historians of Alexander's time who place them in the western region of the P'unjab.

Pallavas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Pahlavas (XLV. 115) which obviously is the correct reading, for the Pallavas were admittedly a southern people. The Pahlavas are generally identified with the Pehlavis or ancient Persians. The Bhīṣma Parva list of the Mahābhārata mentions two tribes of this name (IX, 355 and 375), "but there appear to be no data to make a distinction as the allusions to the Pahlavas are generally vague, unless it be supposed there was a Pahlava colony in the Punjab; and this supposition would suit this verse, for the Persians were altogether outside India. The Harivaṃśa says king Sagara defeated a great confederation of Pahlavas and other people, abro-

gated their laws, degraded them and made them wear beards (XIII, 763-64; XIV, 775-783); but this seems to be a late fable....."¹.

Carmakhaṇḍikas—The Matsya Purāṇa reads *Ātta-khaṇḍikas*, or *Cātta-khaṇḍikas*, and the Bhīṣma Parva list of the Mahābhārata (IX, 355) *Carmamaṇḍalas* instead. These names are not identifiable; but Pargiter's suggestion of its identification with Samarkand is interesting and ingenuous.

Gāndhāras—A great and famous people known from very ancient times. They practically occupied the whole lower basin of the Kabul river. Some passages of the Mahābhārata seem to suggest that the Gāndhāras were an impure people (Śānti Parva, LXV, 2429-31; CCVII. 7560-1; Karna P. XLIV, 2070; vide my "Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India," chap. IX).

Gabalas—The Vāyu and the Matsya Purāṇas read *Yavanas* instead which undoubtedly is the correct reading. The *Yavanas* may be identified with the Indo-Greeks and Greco-Bactrians who held sway over portions of the north-western frontier regions and the Punjab before and after the Christian era, though it seems that the people were known in India even before Alexander's time.

Sindhus and Sauvīras—The Mahābhārata refers frequently to the *Sindhus*; they are mentioned twice in the Bhīṣma Parva list, once in connection with the *Pulindas* and another time with the *Sauvīras* (IX. 348 and 361). The Kūrma Purāṇa (XLVII. 40) mentions the *Hūṇas*, the *Mālyas* (doubtless misreading for *Śālyas* or *Śālvas*) and the *Bālyas* (not identifiable) along with the *Sindhus* and *Sauvīras*.

For a detailed account of these two tribes, see my "Ancient Indian Tribes", Vol. II, pp. 20-22.

Madrakas—They are the same people as the *Madras* or *Mādras* from which tribe came *Mādrī*, the second queen of *Pāṇḍu*. According to epic tradition they were closely related to the *Sauvīras* and *Vāhlikas* (Ādi. P., LXVII, 2695-96). The capital of the Madra country was *Śākala* (Mbh., Sabhā P., XXXI. 1197) or modern Sialkot; and the river *Irāvati* flowed through

¹ Pargiter, Mār. P. p. 314 note.

§ [Annals, B. O. R. I.]

the country (Matsya P. CXIV. 7 and 15-18). Later epic tradition brands the Madras as base and impure (Śānti P., CCVII, 7559-61 ; Harivaṁśa, XIV. 784).

Satadrujas—They are the people who dwelt along the river Sutlej; but the Vāyu Purāṇa reads Śakas and Hradas (XLV, 116), the Matsya, Śakas and Druhyas instead. The Śakas were a well-known people who left their traces on Indian history. They were first a northern and north-western people but gradually spread themselves towards the east and south and founded royal families as far east as Mathura and as far south as Surāṣṭra. The Hradas cannot be identified. The Druhyas were an ancient people, mentioned as early as the Rgveda along with the Anus.

Kaliṅgas (? Kulindas or Pulindas) — It is doubtless a copyist's error, for in no circumstance and never in history the Kaliṅgas were located in the northern or northwestern country, though the Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 376) repeats the same mistake. The correct reading is perhaps Kulindas as given by the Vāyu Purāṇa (XLV. 116) or Pulindas as in the Matsya Purāṇa (CXIII. 41). The Vana Parva of the Mahābhārata speaks of " all the countries of Kulinda " (CLXXVII. 12350) which seems to suggest that the Kulindas were distributed over different countries or a composite people consisting of different tribes. Passages in the Sabhā Parva seem to indicate that the Kulindas occupied the territory along the southern slopes of the Himālayas from the Punjab to Nepal (Sabhā P. XXV. 996 ; LI. 1858-59). The Pulindas were a hill tribe inhabiting the Himālayan region and were closely associated with the Kirātas (Vana p. CXL. 10863-65, Droṇa P. CXXI. 4846-47). Evidently they were aboriginal tribes and were considered as impure. The Rāmāyaṇa associates them with the Śabarās and seems to locate them somewhere in central India ; this location is also upheld by some passages of the Mahābhārata (e. g. Sabhā P. XXVIII. 1068, XXX. 1120 ; Śānti P. CCVII. 7559).

Pāradas—Like the Kulindas the Pāradas was also a hill tribe and were considered *mlecchas* dwelling on the slopes of the Himālayas (Cf. Sabhā P. L. 1832 ; LI, 1869 ; LI. 1858-9 ; Droṇa

P. CXXI. 4819; Hariv. XIII, 763-64; CXV. 6440-42; Manu, X. 43-44).

Hāra-bhūṣikas -- The variant readings are Hāra-pūrikas (Vāyu., XLV., 116) and Hāra-mūrtikas (Matsya, CXIII. 41). None of these names is identifiable. Pargiter suggests Hāra-hūṇakas who are mentioned in the Mahābhārata as a people outside India on the west (Sabhā P., XXXI, 1194; L. 1844; Vana P. LI. 1991).

Mātharas -- The reading is evidently erroneous; the Matsya Purāṇa (CXIII. 43) reads Rāmaṭhas instead. There is a mention of the same people in the Mahābhārata which locates them in the west (Sabhā P., XXXI. 1195; Vana P. LI, 1991, Śānti P. LXV. 2430). The name of the people is also given as Ramaṭas or Ramathas, as in the Vāyu purāṇa (XLV. 117) and also in the Mahābhārata. There is however no clue to their identification.

Bahu-bhadras -- The variants are Bāhu-bādhas (Bhīṣma P. IX. 362) and Bālabhadras (Karṇa P. VI. 153) in the Mahābhārata, and Kaṇṭakāras and Raddha-Kaṭakas in the Matsya and Vāyu Purāṇa (CXIII. 42 and XLV. 117) respectively.

Kaikayas -- They are the same people as the Kekayas or Kaikayas, famous in the Mahābhārata as a powerful nation (Sabhā P. IV. 126; Vana P. CCLXVII 15654). It was from this tribe that came Kaikeyī, the second wife of Daśaratha. The Mahābhārata seems to associate the tribe with the Madras (Sabhā P. LI. 1870; Droṇa P. XX 799), it seems, therefore, that the tribe was settled in the Punjab. The Rāmāyaṇa mentions their capital Rājagṛha or Girivraja (Ādi K. LXXIX. 35-44) which, however, must not be confounded with the city of the same name famous in the time of the Buddha and in the early Buddhist texts. Cunningham identifies the Rājagṛha or Girivraja of the Rāmāyaṇa with Girjāk, the ancient name of Jalalpur, on the river Jhelum (Arch. Sur. Rep., II, 14).

Daśamūlikas -- The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Daśamānikas (XLV. 117) while the Matsya reads Daśanāmakas (CXIII. 42). The Bhīṣma parva list, however agrees with the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (Bhīṣma P. IX. 374) but it is difficult to identify or locate the people.

The Mārkaṇḍeya now proceeds to give a list of people dwelling evidently (Vāhyatonarāḥ) the borders of India. They were the Kāmbojas, the Daradas, the Barbaras, the Harṣavardhanas, the Cīnas and the Tukhāras.

Kāmbojas--The Kāmbojas were a famous people dwelling in the extreme north of the Punjab beyond the Indus. According to epic and later Indian tradition, the country of the Kāmbojas was noted for a particular breed of horses; indeed references to Kāmboja horses are numerous in both the epics. The Mahābhārata associates them with the Cīnas (Bhīṣma P. IX. 373), the Yavanas and Śakas (Udyoga P., XVIII., 590) and the Daradas (Sabhā P., XVI., 1031). According to the same tradition they were considered to be outside the pale of Aryanism (Vana P., CLXXXVIII, 12838-40; Śānti P. CCVII. 7560-61. Vide my "Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India", Chapter VIII.).

Daradas--They were a hill tribe associated in epic tradition with the Kāśmīras (Mbh. Droṇa P. LXX. 2435); the Kāmbojas and the Cīnas (See *ante*) and the Tuṣāras (probably Tukhāras; Vana P. CLXXVII. 12350). They were also considered as *mlecchas*. Vide Indian Culture, Jan'y 1935, p. 388.

Barbaras--Epic tradition connects the Barbaras with the Śakas and Yavanas (Mbh., Sabhā P.; XXXI., 1199; Vana P., CCLIII., 15254; Śānti P., CCVII, 7560-61); evidently they were neighbours of these tribes and were inhabitants of the north-western region. The country of the Barbaras seems to have extended to the Arabian Sea. Their port was called Barbarika which was probably identical with Barbaricum of the Greek geographers (Cunningham's A. G. I., Majumdar's Edn., pp. 693-95). Vide Indian Culture, Jan'y 1935, p. 388.

Harṣavardhanas--The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Priya-laukikas instead, but these names are not identifiable.

Cīnas--Evidently they were the people of China, but here Cīnas certainly do not refer to their original country. Presumably they were those Chinese people who had settled down along the Indian side of the Himālayas from the northwest to the extreme east. Thus in one place in the Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma P. IX. 373) they are associated with the Kāmbojas which seem to

indicate that they were settled in the northwest while in another (Udyoga P. XVIII. 584-85) they are noticed among the soldiers who followed Bhagadatta, king of Prāgyotiṣa, i. e., roughly modern Assam. Still there are other references which seem to indicate that they were settled not very far from the sources of the Ganges (Vana P. CLXXVII. 12350; Śānti P. CCCXXVII. 12226-29). They seem to have been a respectable and well-known people (Udyoga P. XVIII. 584-85). Their country was famous for a particular breed of horses (Udyoga P. LXXXV. 3049).

A people called the Aparā-Cinas (Western Cinas) is mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa (Kiṣ. K. XLIV. 15).

Tukhāras—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Tuṣāras instead (XLV. 118). Both forms are admissible, and the Mahābhārata refers to the people in both the names (Sabhā P. L. 1850; Vana P. LI. 1991; Śānti P., LXV., 2429.). The Rāmāyaṇa also mentions the Tukhāras (Kiṣ. K. XLIV. 15). Epic tradition connects them with the Śakas, Daradas, Pahlavas, etc. They were considered to have been outside the pale of Aryanism.

The *Mārkaṇḍeya* then proceeds to give the names of a few more tribes and countries of the north: they were the Ātreyas, Bharadvājas, Puṣkalas, Kaserurakas, Lampākas, Śūlakāras, Culikas, Jāgudas, Aupadhas, Animadras, Kirātas, Tāmasas, Hamsamārgas, Kāśmīras, Tuṅganās, Śūlikas and the Kuhakas, Urnas and Darvas.

Most of these tribes cannot be satisfactorily identified, for example, the Kaserukas, the Śūlakāras, the Aupadhas, the Animadras, the Tāmasas, the Hamsamārgas and the Kuhakas. Some of these names again are names more of families than of tribes, e. g., the Ātreyas, the Bharadvājas, etc.

Ātreyas—In the Mahābhārata the Ātreyas are said to have been residents of Dvāita-vana (Mbh. Vana P. XXVI. 971), a forest and lake near the Sarasvatī (Ibid, CLXXVII. 12354-62). The Harivaṃśa details the story of their origin from Ṛṣi Prabhākara of Atri's race (XXXI. 1660-68). The tribe is also mentioned in the Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 376) of the Mahābhārata.

Bharadvājas--They are also mentioned in the *Bhīṣma Parva* list (IX. 376) along with the *Ātreyas*. References in the *Great Epic* (*Ādi P.* CXXX. 5102-6; CLXVI. 6328-32; *Vana P.* CXXXV, 10700-728, etc.) to *Ṛṣi Bharadvāja* seem to locate the tribe, who evidently were descended from the *Ṛṣi Bharadvāja*, not far from the upper regions of the *Ganges* near the hills.

Puṣkalas--The name of the tribe seems to connect them with *Puṣkalāvati* or *Puṣkarāvati* (*Rām. Kiṣ. K.* XLIII. 23), the old capital of *Gāndhāra*. The *Vāyu* and *Matsya Purāṇas* read *Prasthalas*. The *Prasthalas* were evidently people of *Prasthala* (*Virāṭa P.* XXX. 971; *Bhīṣma P.* LXXV. 3296; *Droṇa P.* XVII. 691), closely connected with *Trigarta* and therefore located probably in the *Punjab*.

Kuśerukas--The *Vāyu Purāṇa* reads *Kaśerukas* and *Matsya Daserakas* instead, but none of them can satisfactorily be identified. *Daserakas* are however also mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* (*Bhīṣma P.* L. 2080; CXVIII. 5483; *Droṇa P.* XI. 397; XX. 798) as joining in the *Kurukṣetra* war.

Lampākas--The *Lampākas* are described in the *Mahābhārata* as a mountain tribe (*Droṇa P.* CXXI. 4846-7). They are identified by *Cunningham* with the people of *Lamghān* situated to the north-east of *Kabul* (*Anc. Geo. India*, *Majumder's Edn.* pp. 49-50).

Śulakarās--The *Vāyu Purāṇa* reads *Stanapas* instead, but the name is not identifiable.

Culikas--The *Matsya Purāṇa* reads *Sainikas*, and the *Vāyu Purāṇa* reads *Piḍikas* instead.

Jāguḍas--The *Vāyu Purāṇa* reads *Jugūḍas*, the *Matsya Jāngalas*. In another place, however, the *Matsya Purāṇa* "mentions the *Jagūḍas* as a people through whose country the *Indus* flows (CXX. 46-48)¹. But this indication is a bit too vague to admit of any definite identification. The *Jāguḍas* are also mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* (*Vana P.* LI. 1991).

Aupadhas--The *Vāyu Purāṇa* reads *Apagas* instead (XLV.120). No identification is possible.

Animadras--The variant is *Cānimadras* or *Cālimadras*, as in the *Vāyu Purāṇa*.

¹ Pargiter, *Mārk. Purāṇa* p. 322 note.

Kirātas--For a full note on the Kirātas, see Indian Culture, Vol. I, No. 3, "Some Ancient Indian Tribes", pp. 381-82.

Tāmasas--The variant is Tomaras, as in the Vāyu Purāṇa (XLV. 120) and in the Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma P. IX. 377).

Haṁsamārgas--They are also mentioned in the Bhīṣma Parva list of the Mahābhārata. According to the Matsya Purāṇa, the river Pāosni flowed through the countries inhabited by Tamaras and Haṁsamārgas. The description of the Matsya Purāṇa seems to locate the two tribes in the region east of Tibet.

Kāśmīras--They are undoubtedly the people of Kāśmīr. They are also mentioned in the Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 361 and 375).

Tuṅḡanas--The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Taṅgaṇas (XLV. 120) and more than once in the Mahābhārata, as Taṅgaṇas and Para-taṅgaṇas, (Sabhā P. LI. 1859; Bhīṣma P. IX. 372). According to the epic description they were allied with the Kirātas and Pulindas and lived in the kingdom (Vana P. CXL. 10863-5; Sabhā P. LI. 1858-59). They seem to have been a rude tribe, as their main fighting weapon was stone (Droṇa P. CXXI. 4835-47).

Śūlikas--The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Cūlikas which are mentioned as a separate tribe in the Mārkaṇḍeya. According to the Matsya Purāṇa the river Cakṣu flowed through the country of the Śūlikas (CXX. 45, 46). In the Brāhat Saṁhitā mention is made of a tribe called Śāulikas (XIV. 8), but there the Śāulikas are associated with Vidarbha. The Harāhā inscription of the Maukharis makes a reference to the Śūlikas who are identified by some scholars with the Cālukyas; but that does not agree with the Paurāṇic description.

Kuhakas--The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Āhukas or Ahukas instead. They may be the same as the Kurus of the Matsya Purāṇa who are said to have dwelt on the Indus. (CXX. 46-48).

Urṇas--The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Purāṇas but none is identifiable except if we find in the Urṇas a people inhabiting the Urṇa-deśa which Lassen places on the Sutlej near Garhwal. (*Ind. Alt. map.*).

Darvas--The Mahābhārata associates them with the Trigartas, the Daradas and other northern tribes to the north of the Panjab.¹

¹ See also Pargiter, Mārka. P. p. 324 notes.

PRACYA OR EASTERN COUNTRY

....., "Prācyān deśān nivodha me !

Adhrārakā Mudakarā Antar-giryā Vahir-girāḥ ॥
 Yathā Prabaṅgā Raṅgeyā Mānadā Mānavartikāḥ ।
 Brahmottarāḥ Pravijayā Bhārgavā Jñeya mallakāḥ ॥
 Prāgyotiṣāśca Madrāśca Videhāstāmraliptakāḥ
 Mallā Magadhā-Gomantaḥ Prācyā janapadāḥ Smṛtāḥ ॥
 (Mār. P. 57. 42-44).

" Hear from me the peoples who inhabit the Eastern countries. The Adhrārakas, the Mudakaras, the Antargiryas, the Vahirgiras, and the Pravaṅgas also; the Raṅgeyas, the Mānadas, the Mānavartikas, the Brahmottaras, the Pravijayas, the Bhārgavas, the Jñeyamallakas, the Prāgyotiṣas, and the Madras and the Videhas, and the Tāmraliptakas, the Mallas, the Magadhas, the Gomantas, are known as the peoples of the East. "

Adhrārakas—It is difficult to restore the correct reading. The Vāyu Purāṇa has (XLV. 122) Andhravākas.

Mudakaras—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Sujarakas and not Matsya Madgurakas instead. None of these names is identifiable, but one may guess that here is a name which is a corrupt rendering of Mudgagiri or Modagiri, mentioned in literature and inscription and identifiable with the hills of Monghyr in Bihar. Monghyr was anciently known also as Mudgala-puri, Mudgal-āśrama, etc. The Mudgalas or the people of Monghyr are also referred to in the Mahābhārata (Droṇa P. XI. 397).

Antargiryas—These people must be those dwelling in the hilly stretch of the Rajmahal ranges of the Santhal Parganas. They are mentioned in the Bhīṣma Parva list of the Mahābhārata.

Bahirgiras—They must also be said to have been associated with the hilly tracts of Bihar and from their mention along with the Antargiras it seems that the people meant were dwellers on the outskirts of the hills of Bhagalpur and Monghyr regions.

Pravaṅgas—The Pravaṅgas probably stand for those people who dwelt just in front of the Vaṅgas (Pravaṅga), and they may be Aṅgas.

Raṅgeyas—This is evidently a copyist's mistake for Vaṅgeyas which is the reading of the Vāyu Purāṇa (XLV. 122). The Matsya Purāṇa however reads only Vaṅgas. They are undoubtedly the people of ancient Vaṅga or Bengal. For a detailed account of the tribe see my ' Ancient Indian Tribes ', Vol. II, p. 1.

Mānadas--The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Māladās (XLV. 122). It is a shrewd guess of Pargiter that here we have a reference to the people of modern Maldah in which are situated the old cities of Gaur and Pandua. The Māladās are also mentioned as an eastern people in the Mahābhārata (Sabhā P. XXIX. 1081-82; Drona P. VII. 183).

Māna-vārtikas--The variants are Mālavartinah (Vāyu P. XLV. 122) and Mānavarjakas (Mbh. Bhīṣma P. IX. 357); but none of these names are satisfactorily identifiable.

Brahmottaras--Pargiter suggests the reading Suhmotkalas¹ which is neither intended nor necessary, for evidently a better suggestion is that of the Matsya which reads Suhmottaras meaning the people who dwelt north of the Suhma country.

Praviṇayas--The Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 358) of the Mahābhārata seems to read Prāvṛṣeyas; but none of the names is identifiable.

Bhārgavas--The Bhīṣma Parva list mentions the same people as Bhargas; it is permissible to conjecture that they had been intimately associated with the prince Bhārga or Bhārgava who is referred to in the Harivaṁśa as having founded Bhṛgubhūmi or Bhārgabhūmi (XXIX. 1587 and 1597; XXXII. 1753). They were perhaps an eastern branch of the Bhaggas or Bhargas of Sumsumāragiri.

Jñeyamallakas--The variants Geyamarthakas (Vāyu P. XLV. 123) and Gayamālavas (Matsya P. CXIII. 44), but none of these names is identifiable.

Prāgyjyotiṣas--The Prāgyjyotiṣas were a well-known people in both the epics; their country was a famous kingdom, evidently outside the pale of Aryandom. The Mahābhārata frankly refers to it as a *mleccha* kingdom which was ruled over by king Bhagadatta (Sabhā P. XXV. 1000-1; L. 1834; Udyoga P. CLXVI. 5804; Karṇa P. V. 104-5); in the same epic it is referred to also as an *asura* kingdom ruled over by the asuras Naraka and Muru (Vana P. XII. 488; Udyoga P. XLV(I. 1887-92). It seems to have bordered on the realm of Kirātas and Cinas (Sabhā P. XXV. 1002; Udyoga P. XVIII. 584-5). According to the *Raghuvaṁśa* the Prāgyjyotiṣa country lay evidently to the north of the Brahm-

¹ Mērk. Purāṇa, p. 327 note.

4 [Annals, B. O. R. I.]

putra river. It therefore seems that the kingdom included not only the Kāmarūpa country but also a considerable portion of north Bengal and perhaps also of north Bihar.

Madras—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Muṇḍas instead (XLV. 123) which is certainly the more plausible reading, for the Madras cannot in any way be placed in the Eastern region. The Muṇḍas are a well-known pre-Aryan tribe, and are mentioned as such in Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma P. LVI. 2410). The Matsya Purāṇa reads Puṇḍras instead which is certainly the best reading possible here. For a detailed account of the Puṇḍras see my 'Ancient Indian Tribes,' Vol. II. p. 15.)

Videhas—Videha was a famous country from very early times; in very early texts the country is designated as Videgha (e. g. in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa) as well. The country, according to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (I. IV. 1) was separated from Kosala by the Sadānīrā. The capital of the Videha country was Mithilā ruled over by a king named Janaka, and celebrated in both the epics especially in the Rāmāyaṇa. Mithilā is identified by Cunningham with a small town called Janakpur not far from the Nepalese border where the two districts Darbhanga and Muzaffarpur meet (Arch. Sur. Rep. XVI. 34 and map.). The Videha country is thus identical with the northern districts of North Bihar. (Vide my "Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India," Chap. III.)

Tāmrakṛptakas—A variant is Tāmrakṛptikas. The people and the country are well-known in the Mahābhārata (Ādi P. CLXXXVI. 6993; Sabhā P. XXIX. 1098 Droṇa P. LXX. 2436). Other forms of the name are Tāmalīpta or Tāmalīptaka (Vāyu P. XLV. 123) and even Dāma-lipta (Daśakumāracaritam). The country has left its trace in the modern Tamluk in Midnapur.

Mallas—The Vāyu-Purāṇa reads Mālas while the Matsya reads Śālvas, certainly erroneously. The people may be the same as the Māls or Mālas, an indigenous tribe now spread all over Bengal. (Vide my "Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India", Chap. IV.)

Magadhas—They were the people of the region now represented by the modern districts of Patna and Gaya. For an account of the Magadhas see my 'Ancient Indian Tribes' (pp. 93-175).

Gomantas—The variant readings are Govindas (Vāyu Purāṇa XLV. 123), Gonarddhas (Matsya, CXIII. 45) but none of these names is identifiable.

(To be continued)

THE POET BHĀNUKARA

BY

DR. HAR DUTT SHARMA, M. A., Ph. D.

Aufrecht mentions भानुकर (C. C. I, 405) as quoted in the पद्यावृत-तरङ्गिणी by भास्कर, son of आपाजिभट्ट. According to Bhandarkar (*Collected Works*, II, 324, no. 376)¹, भास्कर, the author of the anthology, belonged to an अग्निहोत्रिन् family and wrote a commentary on उत्तररत्नाकर in 1676 A. D. But our poet भानुकर enjoyed much more popularity as his verses are quoted in the following anthologies also.

I. पद्यवेणी by वेणीदत्त, son of जगज्जीवन, grandson नीलकण्ठ and belonging to a याज्ञिक family (*Collected Works*, II, 322, no. 375). He is the author of वासुदेवकथा or चरित, a poem in 7 cantos (C. C. III, 120) and of पञ्चतत्त्वप्रकाश, a glossary which he composed in 1644 A. D. (C. C. I, 304 and 603).

II. सभ्यालंकरण by गोविन्दजी or गोविन्दाजित् (*Collected Works*, II, 325, no. 417).

III. सुभाषितहारावली by श्रीहारेकवि (Peterson, Second Report, pp. 57-64 and no. 92 ; Poona, xviii A, 92 of 1883-4).

IV. रसिकजीवन by गदाधरभट्ट of the 17th century A. D. ² (C. C. I, 497 ; II, 116).

V. पद्यरचना by लक्ष्मणभट्ट आङ्गुलिकर (Kāvya-mālā, 89).

VI. सूक्तिसुन्दर by सुन्दरदेव (Dr. Bhaudaji's Collection. Ms. no. 1237 B. B. R. A. S. The Ms. is written in देवनागरी. Old paper, 18 leaves. The name of the scribe is दामोदर and the date of the copy is शक 1632 [1680 A. D.]. It belongs to रामचन्द्र मुद्गल. It quotes verses from 31 authors and gives their names).³

VII. सारसंग्रह by शंभुदास (Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss. Asiatic Society, Bengal. By the late M. M. Haraprasāda Śāstri, Vol. VII. no. of Ms. 5443).

¹ *Collected Works* of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, edited by N. B. Utgikar.

² See—Notes on Indian Chronology. by Mr. P. K. Gode—V. Rasikajīvana of Gadādharaḥṭṭa and its probable date. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Vol. XII, pp. 396—9.

³ See my article *Sūktisundara of Sundaradeva* (Calutta Oriental Journal, Feb. 1936, pp. 133-44). Sundaradeva flourished in the last quarter of the 17th century A. D. See also Mr. Gode's *Notes on Indian Chronology*, III (Poona Orientalist, July 1936, p. 55).

VIII. सुभाषितसारसमुच्चयः (Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss. by H. P. Śāstri, Vol. VII. no. 5454).

This evidence is enough to prove the importance and popularity of our poet. But as yet his identity has not at all been established. In spite of the fact that Mr. Kane mentions भानुकर or भानुदत्त in his Index of Works ¹ (no. 507), and a भानुदत्तमिश्र (nos. 508, 581 and 598—about 1300 A. C.), he has not been able to throw any light on the personality of भानुकर. According to Mr. Kane भानुदत्तमिश्र is the author of रसमञ्जरी and रसतरङ्गिणी and lived at about 1300 A. D. To भानुकर or भानुदत्त Mr. Kane ascribes the authorship of अलंकारतिलक in five chapters. ²

On भानुदत्त Dr. De remarks ³ — “ The form Bhānukara of this name is given by Śeṣa Cintāmaṇi's °Pariṇāla, Gopāla's °Vikāsa and Raṅgaśāyin's °Āmoda commentaries. The title *miśra* is also appended sometimes to this name. ” I was able to examine a Ms. of शेष चिन्तामणि's रसमञ्जरीपरिमल (जैन भण्डार, उज्जैनबाई की धर्मशाला, अहमदाबाद, डाबडो २६, नं. ९) and found the following introduction.—
इह खलु सकलकविकुलमुकुटमणिमरीचिमञ्जरीनिराजितचरणकमलो हरचरणपरिचरण-
परायणान्तःकरणः श्रीभानुकरनामा कविः etc. The Ms. bears the date वि० सं० १६८४=1627. A. D.

According to Aufrecht (C. C. I, 405 and III, 88) भानुदत्त is from मिथिला and he is the son of गणपति and grandson of महादेव. He is the author of अलंकारतिलक, रसमञ्जरी, रसतरङ्गिणी, गृह्यरदीपिका, गीतगौरीश or गीतगौरीपति and कुमारभार्गवीय. Of these works only रसमञ्जरी, गीतगौरीपति and रसतरङ्गिणी are printed ⁴. Dr. De has been able to prove successfully that all these three works are by one and the same writer. The date of the author, according to him, is earlier than the 14th century A. D. and later than the 12th century A. D. ⁵ According to Mr. Kane, ⁶ भानुदत्त's father गणेश्वर is very likely गणेश्वरमन्त्रिन्, brother of वीरेश्वर, whose son चण्डेश्वर composed विषाद-रत्नाकर and weighed himself in gold in 1315 A. D. “ Therefore,

¹ *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, 2nd edn., 1923. Introduction.

² Ibid. p. CLXI. No. 40.

³ *Sanskrit Poetics* I. 245, In.

⁴ For editions, see *Sanskrit Poetics* I, pp. 245-54.

⁵ *Sanskrit Poetics*, I, p. 249.

⁶ *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, Introduction, p. CXVIII

भानुदत्त flourished probably towards the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 14th century.¹

But how is it that our poet is not at all quoted in the शार्ङ्गधर-पद्धति which was composed about 1363 A. D.²? There are several verses ascribed to a certain भानुपण्डित but none of them is found in any work of our भानुदत्त. भानुपण्डित, as well as the वैद्यभानु of सद्गुणिकर्णामृत, are quite different from our भानुदत्त. If we accept the date of भानुदत्त to be earlier than the 14th century or even the beginning of the 14th century, then he must have been known to the compiler of शार्ङ्गधरपद्धति. भानुदत्त is a pet of the anthologists. पद्यरचना quotes so many as 180 verses of his; रसिकजीवन has not less than 104 and सुभाषितहारावली can boast of at least 11. Under these circumstances, भानुदत्त's verses must have found a place in शार्ङ्गधरपद्धति if he had been living in the 14th century.

The error about his date seems to have started with Burnell's description of भानुदत्त as a native of मिथिला. The fact that he wrote गीतगोरीपति in imitation of गीतगोविन्द of the great मैथिल poet जयदेव lent further support to Burnell's conjecture. And once this hypothesis was taken for granted, it was not difficult to identify his father गणपति or गणेश्वर with गणेश्वरमन्त्रिन् of मिथिला, brother of वीरेश्वर, whose son चण्डेश्वर composed विवादरत्नाकर and weighed himself against gold in 1315 A. D. Another fact which lent a support to the theory of the 14th century is that a Ms. of the रसमञ्जरीविकास by गोपाल (alias बोपदेव), son of नृसिंह is expressly dated in 1428 A. D. But the doubtfulness or rather the error about this date has already been pointed out by the late Śrīdhara R. Bhandarkar. The date of the Ms. of the commentary was read as 1484 and the era was taken to stand for the विक्रम संवत्. But the late S. R. Bhandarkar observed (Report of the Second Tour 1904-6, p. 36) that the date was 1494 and not 1484 as given by Stein (extr., p. 273) and that it indicated the Śaka era. Therefore, it stood for 1572 A. D.³ As it will be proved later on, the observation of S. R. Bhandarkar is supported by other facts also.

¹ *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, Int., p. CXVIII.

² *Sanskrit Poetics*, I, p. 249.

³ *Sanskrit Poetics*, I, pp. 251-2. I am very glad to find that my view is further supported by Mr. P. K. Gode in his Notes on Indian Chronology, XXX—"The *Terminus ad quem* for the date of Bhānudatta, the author of *Rasamañjarī* (Annals of the B. O. R. I., XVI, pp. 145-7).

Now if we compare the list of commentaries on भानुदत्त's works given by Dr. De in his Bibliography ¹, we shall observe two facts. Of the commentaries whose dates are known none is earlier than 1553 A. D., and except for one, all the other commentaries seem to have been composed by writers bearing दाक्षिणात्य names. The exception is रसिकरञ्जनी by वेणीदत्त तर्कवागीश भट्टाचार्य, son of बरिश्चर and grandson of लक्ष्मण. It seems strange that out of 19 commentators none bears a मैथिल name. The theory that भानुदत्त is a native of मिथिला was somewhat thrown into doubt by the term विदेहभूः found in some of the Mss. of रसमञ्जरी. But as other Mss. had विदेहभूः, Sir R. G. Bhandarkar fixed विदेह as भानुदत्त's native place, as the poet "represents the river of the gods or the Ganges as flowing through his country; while the country of the Vidarbhas, which corresponds to the modern Berars, is situated to the south of the Narmāda." ².

But in the above-mentioned Ms. of रसमञ्जरीपरिमल by शेषचिन्तामाणि भानुदत्त is described as ब्रह्मपुरनिवासिन्. This seems to be equivalent to शिवपुरनिवासिन् = Benares. His authorship of गीतगोरीपति, a poem in praise of शिव, also supports this view. There is another possibility. From the following verse one might suspect him to be a resident of Allahabad.

क्षोणीपर्यटनं श्रमाय विहितं वादाय विद्यार्जितं
मानध्वंसनहेतवे परिचितास्ते ते धराधीश्वराः ।
विश्लेषाय सरोजसुन्दरदृशामास्ये कृता दृष्टयः
कुङ्गानेन मया प्रयागनगरे नाराधि नारायणः ॥

रसतरङ्गिणी, p. 35.

This can also explain the fact of his having so many दाक्षिणात्य commentators. For, it is a well-known fact that many families of महाराष्ट्र ब्राह्मणस have long since been established at Benares and Allahabad. Again, if भानुदत्त were a मैथिल and the son of गणेश्वरमन्त्रिन्, one of whose relations weighed himself against gold, then he must have been living in affluent condition. But as it is evident from the verse quoted above and as it will be shown later on, he was wandering from place to place, seeking

¹ Sanskrit Poetics, I, pp. 251-4.

² Collected Works, II, p. 12.

patronage of various rulers. However, nothing can be said definitely about his native place and the problem raised by the two readings विदेहश्च and विदर्भश्च, yet remains to be solved.

Now I give the evidences which once for all settle the question of identity of भानुकर and भानुदत्त. Following verses which are found in रसमञ्जरी, रसतरङ्गिणी and गीतगौरीपति are ascribed to भानुकर in the various anothologies noted against them.

भानुदत्त	भानुकर
विना सायं कोऽयं समुद्यति, etc. रसतरङ्गिणी (Benares edn.) p. 14.	सुभाषितहारावली 81 (8) रसिकजीवन fol. 63a, 62. पद्यरचना 33. 25.
भित्तौ भित्तौ प्रतिफलगतं, etc. रसत० p. 42. निष्पीते कलशोद्भवेन जलधौ, etc. रसत० p. 45 a.	पद्यरचना 72. 21. पद्यरचना 21. 32.
सौन्दर्यस्य मनोभवेन गणना, etc. रसत० p. 53. वीणामङ्गे कथमपि सखी, etc. रसत० p. 72. तातचरणानाम्.	रसिसुन्दर 13 a, 3. रसिक० fol. 66 a, 98. सु० हारावली 34 (70).
अनुवनमनुयान्तं बाष्पवारि, etc. रसत० p. 77 a. क्रीडातुङ्गचतुरङ्गटापपटली, etc. रसत० p. 77. भूयादिष सतां हिताय भगवान्, etc. रसत० p. 81 a.	पद्यरचना 84. 7. पद्यरचना 86. 19. पद्यरचना 2. 10. सु० हारावली 6 (43). रसिक० fol. 9, 93. पद्यरचना 87. 26.
दिव्यहरेर्मुखकुहरे, etc. रसत० p. 81 a. आत्मीयं चरणं दधाति पुरतो, etc. रसमञ्जरी, 1. गीतगौरीपति p. 90, 2.	पद्यरचना 72. 3.
अकरोः किमु नेत्रशोणिमानं, etc. रसम० 51. गीतगौ० p. 146.	पद्यरचना 53. 5.
गतागतकुतूहलं नयनयोः, etc. रसम० (परिमल) p. 7, 2.	पद्यरचना 46. 4.
गीतगौरीपति अवधयोः, etc. रसम० (परिमल) p. 11 a, 5.	पद्यरचना 50. 23.
स्वापे प्रियाननबिलोकनहानिरेव, etc., रसम० (परिमल) p. 14, 1.	पद्यरचना 50. 24.
कान्तानुरागचतुरोऽसि मनोहरोऽसि, etc. रसम० (परिमल) p. 18, 14.	रसिक० fol. 72 a, 14.

भानुदत्त	भानुकर
अयं रेवाकुञ्जः कुसुमशरसेवा, etc.	पद्यरचना 50. 26.
रसमं (परिमल) p. 23, 18.	
श्वश्रुः कुड्यत् निर्दिशन्तु सुहृदो, etc. रसमं (परिमल)	पद्यरचना 51. 29.
p. 24 a, 18.	रसिकं fol. 74, 34.
एते वारिकणान् किरन्ति पुरुषान्, etc.	पद्यरचना 51. 32.
रसमं (परिमल) 24 a, 19.	सुंहारावली 25 (276).
त्वं दूति निरगाः कुञ्जं, etc. रसमं (परिमल) p. 28 a, 31.	पद्यरचना 54. 12.
वपुषि तव तनोति रत्नभूषां, etc. रसमं (परिमल) p. 28, 32.	पद्यरचना 53. 2.
माला बालाम्बुजदलमयी, etc. रसमं (परिमल) p. 31 a, 39.	पद्यरचना 54. 7.
वक्षोजखण्डितमुरो दयितस्य, etc. रसमं (परिमल) 32 a, 42.	पद्यरचना 53. 3.
विरमति कथनं विना न खेदः etc. रसमं (परिमल) p. 33 a, 48.	पद्यरचना 53. 6.
नायं सुखति सुखवामपि, etc. रसमं (परिमल) p. 47 a, 80.	पद्यरचना 47. 8.
शून्ये सद्यनि योजिता बहुविधा, etc. रसमं (परिमल) p. 58, 19.	पद्यरचना 74. 12.
जीवेन तुलितं प्रेम, etc. गीतगौ० p. 18, 4.	पद्यरचना 42. 18.
यदेतल्लावण्यं दस्तरलपङ्केरुहदृशो	यदेतल्लावण्यं भगवति
रजोलग्नं मार्गे निपतति पदाम्भोरुहयुगात् ।	भवप्रेमलहरि त्वदीयाद्ग्रे-
विनिर्मातुं शातक्रतवपुरपङ्केरुहमुखी—	स्मात्पथि सह रजोभिर्वि-
स्तदु... परैरपहरति मन्ये मनसिजः ॥ गीतगौ० p. 48, 7.	गलति । विनिर्मातुं शात-
	क्रतुतवपुरपङ्केरुहमुखी-
	स्तदुल्लावण्यं भगवति
	मन्ये कमलधुः ॥
	पद्यरचना 7. 38.

I think that this evidence is enough to establish the identity of भानुकर with भानुदत्त. In my article, "The Subhāsitahārāvālī of Śrī Hari Kavi and some poets enjoying the patronage of Muslim Rulers" (Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. X, 1934, pp. 478-485), I have proved that भानुकर flourished in the middle of the 16th century A.D. I am now inclined to put him in the early part of the 16th century A.D. The पद्यरचना throws much light on भानुकर's age. Even at the risk of repeating some of the arguments already advanced by me in my article referred to above, I give below the details by which I fix his age. In पद्यरचना and other anthologies we find 2 verses of भानुकर in king कृष्ण's honour, 3 in वीरभानु's, 1 in Sher Shah's and 9 in Nizam's. They are as follows:—

कृष्ण—

कृष्णं समरसतृष्णं दृष्टवतो [भान्ति] विष्टरश्रवसः ।
राजन्यजन्ममूले भुजमूले पुलकमुकुलानि ॥

पद्यरचना 16.3.

प्रस्थानं रतिमन्दिरात्कमालिनीबन्धोरपि प्रेक्षणं
काकुः केलिविधिं विनापि चरणन्यासः पृथिव्यामपि ।
किं च क्लान्तमतालवृन्तपवनः प्रत्यङ्गमालिङ्कति
द्रष्टव्यं किमतोऽपि कृष्णनृपतेः प्रत्यर्थिवामभ्रवाम् ॥

पद्यरचना 27.63.

वीरभानु—

लङ्काधामानि वीरभानुनृपतेः प्रेक्ष्य प्रतापोदयं
प्रत्यागारमधीरनीरजदृशो भूयो हुताशभ्रमात् ।
क्षुभ्यद्वाणि विभूतपाणि विगलन्मुक्तामणि प्रस्वलद्
बाष्पश्रेणि विलोलवेणि दयितं कण्ठस्थले बिभ्रति ॥

सारसंग्रह 31 A; पद्यरचना 13, 23.

सूक्तिसुन्दर 10, 6, रसिक० fol. 13, 23.

भेरीभाङ्कृतिभिस्तुरङ्गनिनदैः कुम्भीन्द्रकोलाहलैः
प्रस्थाने तव वीरभान दलितं ब्रह्माण्डभाण्डोदरम् ।
आधाय ज्वलति प्रतापदहने रङ्गैः पुनर्वधसा
तारानाथकतारकासुरसारिद्रव्याजादिवायोजितम् ॥

सूक्तिसुन्दर 15, 7; पद्यरचना 18, 16.

रसिक० fol. 19 a, 76.

डिह्लीशो द्वारदेशे नमति गजपतिस्तत्परस्तादुपास्ते
गौडेन्द्रो नम्रमूर्द्धा तदनु नरपतिर्गुर्जराधीश्वरोऽपि ।
श्रुत्वैवं वन्दिवुन्दादवनतवदनो गौरवं तत्र कुर्वन्
वीरश्रीवीरभानो रचयसि पुलकं वीरलक्ष्मीकोपले ॥

सारसंग्रह 31 A.

Although the name of भानुकर is not given in the description of सारसंग्रह but as it follows one of भानुकर's verses and is in praise of वीरभानु I am convinced that its author is भानुकर himself. Mr. Gode quotes this verse in his article on वीरभानु.

सेरसाह—

श्लोकार्थे वा तदर्थे यदि हि विनिहितं दूषणं दुर्वृत्तैः
किं नश्छिन्नं तदा स्यात् कविकुलविदुषां काव्यकोटीश्वरानाम् ।
वाहाश्चेद् गन्धवाहाधिकमुभगरयाः पञ्चषाः काणखञ्जाः
का हानिः सेरसाहसि तपकुलमणेश्वकोटीश्वरस्य ॥

सु० हारावली fol. 42, 273.

निजामशाह—

चिद्वद्गोष्ठीवरिष्ठ प्रतिभटदमन श्रीनिजाम प्रतीमः
कृत्वा त्वत्कीर्तिगाथां ब्रह्मति गणाविधिं पद्मयोनिः कठिन्या ।
वक्त्र लेखा गुरुणाममृतकरकलाकम्बुमल्लीमरालाः
शुद्धा लेखा लघूनां बिसभुजगन्भोनिमगादन्तिदन्ताः ॥

पद्यरचना 10, 8; रसिक० 15, 45.

क्षोणीकाम निजामशाह भवतः प्रौढैः प्रतापानलै-
र्वागैव ब्रवरूपतामुपगते चामीकराणां चये ।
अश्वत्थासवधामधोरणि मुहुर्मज्जद्ग्रहग्रामणि
त्रस्यत्कामिनि निष्पतद्वनितलं मेरोः समुन्मीलति ॥

पद्यरचना 13, 24; रसिक० fol. 13, 23.

दाने द्राघीयासि कपटतः स्वस्ताडिन्याः कठिन्या-
..... तव कृतवता गारभितौ ।
नापि प्रापि कचिदपि श्रीनिजामद्वितीय-
स्तेनाकारि स्थागितमनसा वेधसा बिन्दुरिन्दुः ॥

पद्यरचना 14, 32.

क्षोणीकाम निजामशाह विलसत्सिन्दूरकुन्दस्रजि-
न्नष्टा त्वच्चरणं विधाय निदधे वैरिश्रियो मूर्धनि ।
सीमन्तस्य चकास्ति कापि सरणिस्तस्योर्ध्वरेखादयः
सिन्दूरस्य कणा जयन्ति किरणाः कुन्दानि मन्ये नखाः ॥

पद्यरचना 16, 4.

अयं कामो निजामो वा त्वया किमवधारितम् ।
इति दृष्टिरिव प्रष्टुं श्रुतिं श्रयति सुभ्रुवाम् ॥

पद्यरचना 17, 6.

बाह्व्यूहसुरक्षतां वसुमतीं संवीक्ष्य मूर्च्छावर्तीं
मेरीभाकृतिवञ्चलेन पयसा वारानिधिः सिञ्चति ।
दिग्बाला तनुते निजामनृपतेर्बातं पताकांशुकै-
र्धूळीधोरणिरश्विनीसुतमिष प्रष्टुं दिवो धावति ॥

पद्यरचना 18, 14.

चरणार्पणबहलपीडाभिः ।

रचयति बाहिरिव रसनामरुणध्वजकैतवादानिः ॥

पद्यरचना 19, 17.

निजामवसुधाधिपे क्षिपति शोणकोणे वृशौ

रणाङ्गणसमुद्भटैः प्रतिभटैर्विभिन्नीकृतम् ।

वपुर्विपुलवेपथु व्यथितमब्जिनीप्रेयसो

व्रणज्वराविशङ्कया किमु पताकया स्पृश्यते ॥

पद्यरचना 19, 18.

क्षोणीकाम निजाम तावकभुजं लब्ध्वा भुजङ्गेश्वरं

जानीमः करवालकालभुजगी किं नाम गर्भिण्यभूत् ।

यद्भिन्नेभकपोललोलविगलन्मुक्ताकलापच्छला-

दच्छामण्डपरंपरामधिरणं सूते स्फुरन्ती मुहुः ॥

पद्यरचना 20, 26.

Fortunately it is easy to identify कृष्ण and Sher Shah. The former stands for कृष्णदेवराय, king of विजयनगर (1509-1530 A. D.). Sher Shah's time is 1540-1545 A. D. The only difficulty which stood in the way of identifying वीरभानु has been now overcome by the publication of MM. Haraprasāda Śāstri's Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss., Vol. VII. Herein we find a Ms. of सोमदेव's कथा-सरित्सागर which was copied by रूपणि, a poet at the court of भावसिंह of Rewah State. The scribe रूपणि gives a genealogy of his patron who is 23rd in the line of Vāghela rulers of Rewah. Tracing their descent from कर्णदेव of Gujarat, the poet describes the various rulers and at the end mentions some of his contemporaries at the court. Following is the table:—

1 कर्णदेव	9 वरियार	17 वीरभानु married to सुकुमारदेवी
2 सुहागदेव	10 बोलारदेव	18 रामचन्द्र
3 सारंग	11 सिंहदेव	19 वीरभद्र
4 बीसलदेव	12 वीरम	20 विक्रमादित्य
5 भीममल्ल	13 नरहरि	21 अमरेश
6 रानिकदेव	14 भेद [र] देव	22 अनूपसिंह married to कमला
7 बलन	15 शालिवाहन	23 भावसिंह
8 बलक	16 वीरसिंह	

This account is corroborated by the account of Rewah State given in the Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol. XXI, pp. 279 ff. I quote a few relevant passages below—

“Chiefs of Rewah are Baghel Rājputs, descended from the Solanki clan which ruled over Gujarāt from the 10th to the 13th Century. Vyāghradeo, brother of the ruler of Gujarāt is said to have made his way into North India, about the middle of the 13th century and obtained the fort of Marpha, 18 miles north-east of Kālanjar. His son Karan Deo, married a Kalacuri (Haihaya) princess of Māndla and received in dowry the fort of Bāndhogarh, which until its destruction by Akbar in 1597 was the capital of Baghel possessions..... In 1298 Karan Deo, the last Baghel ruler of Gujarāt was driven from his country by Ulugh-khan, acting under the orders of the Emperor Alā-uddin. In 1494 Sikandar Lodi advanced against Rājā Bhaira or Bhīra of Panna..... In 1498-9, Sikandar Lodi attacked Bhīra's son and successor, Śālivāhana, for refusing to grant him his daughter in marriage.” The son of Śālivāhana was Bīra Singh Deo (वीरचुसिंह of our ms.), founder of Bīra Singhpur in Panna state. “He was followed by his son Bīra Bhān who had lived for sometime at Sikandar's court. The next chief was Rāma chandra (1555-92), the contemporary of Akbar.”

From this it is clear that वीरभानु, being a contemporary of Sikandar Lodi must have come to throne in the beginning of the 16th century. Sikandar Lodi died in 1517, so it must have been at the close of his reign that वीरभानु lived at his court. For, we know that वीरभानु's son and successor रामचन्द्र ascended his throne in 1555 A. D. ¹.

¹ Mr. P. K. Gode, in his article “Some data for the identification of Virabhānu, the patron of the poet Bhānukara” (*Calcutta Oriental Journal*, 1934, p. 197ff), has found out some epigraphical records mentioning वीरभानु. He arrives at the conclusion that this वीरभानु is identical with “a Hindu King called Bhānu, who was the grandfather of the brothers Mādhavasimha and Mānasimha, the favourites of Emperor Akbar (A. D. 1556-1605), and father of Bhagavantadāsa. This information is recorded in the Rāgamañjarī of Puṇḍerika Viṭṭhala in the following verse—श्रीमत्कच्छपवंशदीपिकमहाराजाधिराजेश्वर—
तेजःपुञ्जमहाप्रतापनिकते भानुः सितौ राजते । तस्यासीद्भगवन्तदासनयो वीराधिबीरेश्वरः शोणमंडलमंडने
विजयते भूमंडलाखंडलः ॥ ”

Now, our poet being patronised by वीरभानु should be placed in the beginning of the 16th century A. D. So far only 3 verses of our poet in honour of वीरभानु have been found. But we find 9 verses in honour of निजाम. This shows that our poet spent more time at the court of निजाम than at the court of वीरभानु. This is

Although, chronologically speaking, this King भानु of कच्छवंश might coincide with our वीरभानु, still I am inclined to think that both are different. Our वीरभानु belongs to वाघेलवंश. In the first place we find that our poet's patron is वीरभानु or वीरभान, which is the name of the Rewah ruler also. The king of कच्छ family is simply भानु. Secondly, our poet sings the praises of वीरभानु and निजामशाह (Sikandar Lodi). It has been shown that वीरभानु and Sikandar Lodi (निजामशाह) were closely associated with each other. Hence there is stronger reason to identify our poet's patron with वाघेल वीरभानु than with the कच्छवंशीय भानु.

[N. B.—Mr. Gode writes to me in a letter dated Poona, 13th March, 1935—“ Since writing my note in the Calcutta Journal I have come across some further data about a King Virabhānu whose grandson Virabhadra wrote a work in A. D. 1577. This King belongs to the Vāghela dynasty. As the grandson of Virabhānu wrote in A. D. 1577, Virabhānu must have flourished between 1500 and 1550 A. D. In this hypothesis two points of identification are useful, viz., (1) the name Virabhānu and (2) the date of Virabhānu's grandson which is A. D. 1577.”]

We find another mention of वीरभानु of वाघलेवंश in प्रद्योतनभट्टाचार्य's commentary शरदागम on चन्द्रालोक (Kashi Sanskrit Series, No. 75. 1929).

अस्य स्थितितो नगरी भवतोऽयोध्या भवत्यखिला ।

इति रघुवंशाधिको जयति वाघेलाभिधो वंश ॥ ३ ॥

देवपतिरिव शक्तिर्यस्य जये भूभुतां प्रथिता ।

श्रीवीरभद्रदेवस्तत्र वराऽऽवण्डलो जतः ॥ ४ ॥

दशरथतो रघुपतिरिव तस्मादिह वीरभानुभूपालः ।

आबद्धधर्मसितुर्जगति समुद्रे समुद्भूतः ॥ ५ ॥

नत्तनयो नयनिर्मलकीर्तिः स्वनिम्नगाग्रलम् ।

Here the editor gives the following footnote—वीरभद्रकारितग्रन्थान्तरपरामर्शतोऽन्य-प्रकरणानुसन्धानाच्च पञ्चमपष्ठःपर्ययोर्मध्ये.....‘ रामचन्द्र ’ नामकनृपवर्णनपरमेकं पद्यमपेक्षितं भानि । The colophon at the end of the commentary is—इति श्रीमहागजाधिगजश्रीरामचन्द्र-देवात्मजयुवराजवीरभद्रदेवाद्वैतमिश्रश्रीबलभद्रात्मजसकलशास्त्रारविन्दश्रियोतनभट्टाचार्यविरचिते चन्द्रालोकप्रकाशे शरदागमे दशमो मूलखण्डः समाप्तः ॥ Now, this confuses our position of वीरभानु, who is here made the son of वीरभद्र and grandson of रामचन्द्र. According to the genealogy given in the Ms. of कयासरित्सागर, वीरभानु is the father of रामचन्द्र. The grandson of रामचन्द्र and the son of वीरभद्र bears the name of विक्रमादित्य. I am inclined to think that वीरभानु is a mistake here for विक्रमादित्य.

further supported by निजाम's date. In my article referred to above I identified this निजाम with Nizam Shah Boorhan Shah I (1510-1553 A. D.) of the Nizamshahi dynasty. But now I think that निजाम stands for Nizām khān, son of Bahlol Lodi. This Nizām khān later on assumed the title of Sikandar Lodi (See—Smith : India in the Muhammadan Period, 1923, p. 254). Therefore, we can draw the conclusion that our poet भानुकर spent major part of his life at Sikandar Lodi's Court (the time of Sikandar's reign is 1489-1517) and must have met वीरभानु there. At the death of Sikandar he seems to have gone to the court of वीरभानु. After a short stay there he seems to have migrated towards the south and enjoyed the patronage of कृष्णराय of विजयनगर. But his wandering nature or the death of कृष्णराय in 1529 prompted our poet once more to move towards the North where he visited the court of Sher Shah. That he had a chequered life is evident from his wanderings, and that he was respected and deserved respect at all places is evident from the works he composed and the verses which have replenished so many anthologies.

His father गणपति also must have been a poet of high order. Not only does भानुकर speak highly of him in—

ताते निर्गच्छति गणपतौ नाकमयापि तस्या

वाचां देव्यास्त्यजति शिथिलं कङ्कणं नैव दोषोः ।

अयाप्यार्द्राभवति कुचयोर्नापि पाटीरपङ्क्तौ

नेत्रे निर्यत्पयासि न पुनः कज्जलं स्थैर्यमेति ॥

रसत० p. 23.

but verses of गणपति are quoted in रसिकजीवन, पद्यवेणी, पद्यासुतरङ्गिणी, सभ्यालंकरण and पद्यरचना. There is no doubt that he is different from the गणपति mentioned by राजशेखर in जह्मण's सूक्तिमुक्तावली, and his namesake whose verses are quoted in सद्गुक्तिकर्णासुत.

In the ms. of कुमारभार्गवीय Dr. De has found the pedigree of भानुकर as follows : रत्नेश्वर, सुरेश्वर (author of शारीरकभाष्यवार्तिक) विश्वनाथ-रविनाथ-भवननाथ-महादेव-गणपति-भानुदत्त.¹

¹ Sanskrit Poetics I, p. 250. I cannot agree with Dr. De when he identifies सुरेश्वर with सुरेश्वराचार्य or मण्डनमिश्र, the author of शारीरकभाष्यवार्तिक, for the latter was a contemporary of शंकराचार्य (8th century A. D.) and it is impossible that the 5 ancestors of भानुकर intervening between सुरेश्वर and himself could have lived away 700 years between themselves, unless we suppose that भानुकर has dropped the names of some of his unimportant ancestors.

Our poet must have visited the court of king कृष्णदेवराय of विजयनगर for a short time and probably in the latter part of his career. It is here or at the court of बीरभानु that he sang—

यवनीनयनाम्बुधोरणीभिर्धरिणीनामपहाय तापवह्निम् ।

सुकुतद्रुमसेकमाचरन्तं धृतकलकं प्रणमामि निर्विकल्पम् ॥

रसिक० fol. 10, 106.

It is most probable that he wrote his गीतगौरीपाति, रसमञ्जरी, अलंकार-तिलक, गङ्गावरीपिका and कुमारभार्गवीय in the prime of his life and रस-तरङ्गिणी was his last work as is evident from the verse क्षोणीपर्यटनं अमाय विहितं, etc., quoted above.

As already pointed out amongst his works गीतगौरीपाति, रसमञ्जरी and रसतरङ्गिणी have been published, but others are still in ms. form. That our poet is the author of कुमारभार्गवीय is inferred from the following verses which are apparently quoted from that work in पद्यरचना-

रामे ब्राह्मणवेषधारिणि धनुर्धृत्वा कराम्भोरुहे
संजन्याङ्गुलिकास्रमारचयितुं कैलासमाकर्षति ।
तात त्राहि सुत प्रयाहि दयिते निर्याहि सौधाद्वाहि-
वारं वारमयं पुरान्तकपुरक्षोभः शिवायास्तु वः ॥

पद्यरचना 3, 14.

मूर्ध्नो मन्मथशासितुर्विगलिते क्षीराशयास्वादिते
वक्त्रे बालतुषारभासि पारितः कण्ठोदरे तिष्ठति ।
शेषं वीक्ष्य विलोलशोणनयनं भिन्नाधरौष्ठश्रियं
व्यातन्वन्करतालिकां विहसितं बालो विशाखो दधौ ॥

पद्यरचना 6, 32.

शृङ्गे शिरीषमालां कण्ठे घण्टां पदेषु मञ्जीरम् ।
विन्यस्य प्रतिभवनं भर्गवृषं भ्रामयामास ॥

पद्यरचना 6, 33.

As regards अलंकारतिलक and गङ्गावरीपिका, it is very difficult to pronounce any judgment before their Mss. are thoroughly examined.

In the end I am tempted to give those verses of भानुकर which are nowhere printed but found only in the Mss.

रे रे कोकिल मा भज मौनं किञ्चिदुदञ्चय पञ्चमरागम् ।

नो चेत्त्वामिह को जानीते काककदम्ब[म्बैः] पिहिते चूते ॥

रासिक० fol. 34^a, 152.

संकेतकेलिगृहमेत्य निरीक्ष्य शून्यमेणीदृशो निष्कृ [त] निःश्वसिता-

धरायाः ।

अर्धाक्षरं वचनमर्थविकाशि नेत्रं ताम्बूलमर्थकवलीकृतमेव तस्थौ ॥

ibid fol. 76, 59.

स्फुरदुरासिजभारभङ्गगुराङ्गी किसलयकोमलकान्तिना पदेन ।

अथ कथय कथं सहेतुं गन्तुं यदि न निशासु मनोरथो रथः स्यात् ॥

ibid fol. 77^a, 62.

वदयाति हृदि यस्य नैव लज्जा न च करुणा न च कोऽपि भीतिलेशः ।

बेकुलमुकुलकोशकोमलायां [भां] पुनरपि तस्य करे न पातयेथाः ॥

ibid fol. 77^a, 84.

कान्ते कनकजम्बीरं करे किमपि कुर्वति ।

आगारलिखिते भानौ बिन्दुमिन्दुमुखी दधौ ॥

ibid fol. 79^a, 87,

सा चन्द्रसुन्दरमुखी स च नन्दसूनुदैवाक्षिकुञ्जभवनं समुपाजगाम ।

अत्रान्तरे सहचरस्तरणी कठोरे पानीयपानकपटेन सरः प्रतस्थे ॥

ibid fol. 80^a, 96.

ईषत्कम्पयोधरं गुरुकटिप्रौढप्रहाराद्भुतं

स्त्रियद्भालमनेकहास्यसरसं संरम्भमन्द्ययम् ।

वारं वारमुरःप्रहारसुभगं [सं] दृश्यमानाधरं

किञ्चिद्वृत्तानितम्बदर्शनवरं धन्यो रतं सेवते ॥

ibid, fol. 101, 95.

पाथोदजालत [ज ?] टिलं.....शरदङ्गना ।

अम्बरं धावयामास चन्द्रिकाचयवारीभिः ॥

ibid, fol. 115, 97.

अलक्षितकुचाभोगं भ्रमती नृत्यभूमिषु ।

स्मरेणापि चकोराक्षी न लक्ष्यीक्रियते शरैः ॥

ibid, fol. 135, 104.

दुःखं दीर्घतरं बहत्यापि सखीवर्गाय नो भाषते

शैवालैः शयनं सृजत्यापि पुनः शीतेन वा लज्जया ।

कंठे गद्गदवाचमश्नाति दृशोर्धत्ते न बाष्पोदकं

संतापं सहते यदम्बुजमुखी तद्वेद चेतोभवः ॥

सु० हारावली 34^a (62).

पायाद् बुद्धवपुः स यत्र सहसा व्यालोडयत्यागमा-

नौकारेण भयातुरेण चालितं बिन्दुं विहाय काचित् ।

ओंकारः करपङ्कजं पुराभिदो भजे त्रिशूलच्छलाद्

बिन्दुश्चक्रमिषेण कैटभरिपोस्तस्थौ कराम्भोरुहे ॥

दत्तं मया पदमिदं नवयौवनाय त्वं सत्वरं कचन शैशव साधयेति ।

कामस्य हस्तालिखिताक्षरमालिकेव रोमावली विजयते जलजे-

क्षणायाः ॥

रसिक० fol, 65, 93.

इयं मृष्टा चञ्चत्कनकलतिका पङ्क(ज) भुवा

निषक्ता लावण्यामृतरसभरेणानुदिवसम् ।

अकस्माद्रोमालीमधुपपटलीह स्फुरति यत्

ततः शङ्के पुष्पोद्गमसमयमायातमधुना ॥

ibid, fol. 66^a, 95.

रचयति युवनं ब्रक्षेत्रपीयूषवृष्टिं नवजलधररेखारोमराजिच्छलेन ।

यदुदयति कलापिप्राक्रियेयं तदुच्चैः (:) स्तनघनसमयोऽस्यामाविरस्ती-

ति विद्यः ॥

ibid, fol. 66^a, 97.

पद्भ्यां मुक्तास्तरलगतयः संश्रिता लोचनाभ्यां

श्रोणीभागस्त्यजति तनुतां सेवते मध्यभागः ।

धत्ते चक्षुः कु[क] चसचिवतामाद्वितीयत्वमास्यं

तद्वात्राणां गुणविनिमयः कल्पितो यौवनेन ॥

ibid, fol. 79^a, 142.

छोलालिपुञ्जे व्रजतो निकुञ्जे स्फारा बभूवुः श्रमवारिधाराः ।

देहे समीहे भवतो विधातुं धीरं समीरं नालिनीदलेन ॥

ibid, fol. 72^a, 13.

द्वित्रैः केलिसरोरुहं त्रिचतुरैर्धम्मिल्लमल्लीस्रजं

कण्ठान्मौक्तिकमालिकां च तदनु त्यक्ता[क्त्वा] पदैः पञ्चाभिः ।

अन्तः कान्तवियोगकातरतया दूराभिसारातुरा

तन्वङ्गी निरुपायमध्वानि परं श्रोणोभरं निन्दति ॥

ibid, fol. 77^a, 61.

× + × + × ×

Dr. S. K. De has appended in this very number of the *Annals* a note on my article. Therein he contests my evidence for proving the identity of भानुदत्त with भानुकर. According to him the evidence supplied by anthologies should be taken very cautiously. But the external evidence of so many as *eight* anthologies and the internal evidence of both भानुदत्त and भानुकर referring to one निजामधरणीपाल or निजामशाह, cannot be easily dismissed on the slender ground of unreliability of anthologies, unless some positive evidence to the contrary is forthcoming. भानुकर belongs to the middle of the 16th century and amongst the anthologies that quote him पद्मवेणी belongs to the middle of the 17th century सुकिञ्चुन्दर to the last quarter of the 17th century and रसिकजीवन to the 17th century. So, even if we do not know the date of पद्मरचना for certain, the above-named three anthologies, which were composed within about a hundred years of भानुकर's date, could not have committed one and the same mistake of confusing भानुदत्त with भानुकर.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE FIGURES OF SPEECH IN THE RĠVEDA *

BY

ABEL BERGAIGNE

Translated into English by A. Venkatasubbiah

COMBINATIONS OF INCOHERENT METAPHORS

[20] The first verse of the hymn to Savitr, X, 149, begins thus : " Savitr has restrained the earth with the reins ; Savitr has sustained the sky in the space without support". Up to this point, the verse speaks only of cosmogonic marvels with a very harsh allusion to the bizarre representation of the worlds in the form of mares brought to a stop by the god who has organised the universe. Now the atmosphere is, like the earth, compared to a horse. It is also compared to an ocean or to a cow. As horse, it is capable of being fastened ; as cow, it is capable of being milked ; but what a strange combination of these diverse figures is presented by the second half of our verse : " He has milked the atmosphere like a trembling horse, the ocean fastened in an inaccessible place."

The conception of a god ' propping up ' the sky and the earth is one very familiar to the Vedic poets. The author of the verse I, 62, 7 keeps all this when comparing the sky and the earth to two ' women '.

The separation of the two worlds is compared to that of two skins. But what makes the formula of the verse VI, 8, 3 bizarre is that the two worlds receive in it at the same time the name of ' couples ' : " Agni has separated the two couples like two skins". This figure of the ' couples ', which suits well only the conception of the two worlds as the two recipients of the

* Continued from pp. 61-83, Annals, B. O. R. I. Vol. XVII, part (i).

1 Ludwig rejects the meaning given to the word विपुल by Roth. This meaning however seems to be the one which explains best the different uses of the word. Grassmann admits it, but he replaces here the figurative word by the unfigurative expression ' the worlds '.

waters or of the Soma, produces a no less singular effect in the verse I, 160, 1 which shows us the sun 'pursuing his way' between the two couples, and adds that these two couples are 'well-born'. The same figure denotes also the three worlds in a passage where they ought to be represented rather as three cows, since it speaks of three bulls that fecundate them: "The three bulls, brilliant and separate, fecundaters of the three couples",¹ V, 69, 2.

The Dawns are sometimes cows and sometimes warrior virgins. In the verse I, 92, 1, they are at the same time called cows and compared to warriors who make ready their weapons.

They are also compared, however strange the idea may seem to us, to the sacrificial posts, IV, 57, 2. It is more easy to understand why they are compared to birds, and particularly, [21] in case the word हंस can be taken in its classical sense and interpreted as swans, that is to say, as birds with red wings. Hence without doubt the strange formula: "The brilliant posts have come towards us like swans that rush in flocks", III, 8, 9.

The Dawn is also at the same time a 'mare,' and the mother of 'cows', IV, 52, 2. We have already mentioned the bizarre combination that makes of the celestial ocean an ocean of 'cows'. By the addition of another figure which assimilates the diffusion of light to the effusion of the waters, one arrives at the 'splendour of the Dawn containing an ocean of cows', II, 34, 12. Grassmann suppresses here the idea of 'ocean': Ludwig replaces the idea of 'cow' with that of 'milk'.² The mountain is the mythological figure of the cloud and the sky; the horse is that of the lightning or the sun. By combining them,

¹ Unlike Ludwig, Grassmann avoids connecting the genitive धिषणीन् with रेतोधाः. But the combination of ideas that I have dwelt upon is the more easy to admit inasmuch as it occurs again in a well-known myth. See VII, 33, 11 and 33.

² See below, p. 30 ff. The formula however appears to be capable of being also explained in the sense that the Dawn gives an ocean of cows, and it is, without doubt, in this way that we should understand in the the verse X, 76, 3 the juxtaposition of the epithets 'that has an ocean of cows' and 'that has a garment of horses'. Regarding the metaphor of the garment, see below, p. 36.

one thus gets the explanation of the idea that the lightning or the sun delays in appearing: "The mountain does not give the horse", V, 54, 5. Grassmann, who has indicated in his dictionary the correct meaning of the word अनसदा has then given to it an interpretation which must without doubt be regarded as a *lapsus*.¹ Ludwig proposes two meanings, one of which is the correct² one; but he seems to find it unintelligible.

The lightning is a fire that may be considered as sustained, like the terrestrial fire, by fuel. This fire dwells in the waters of the sky, which, on their part, are called cows. Thus it comes about that there are 'cows' containing 'fuel',³ II, 34, 5.

'Cooked in the raw ones' is a well-known expression for the 'milk in the cows.'⁴ Although this formula can have a meaning when applied to natural cows and although in fact milk is called the offering 'cooked in the udder',⁵ X, 179, 3, it nevertheless seems to me certain that it is also applied and principally, like that of 'the milk, white, brilliant, [22] in the black cows and the red cows',⁶ to the raw cows, that is to say, to the frigid ones of the sky⁷, Nights, Dawns and clouds, whence issues the brilliant splendour of the sun or the lightning.

Now if the clouds are cows, they are also fortresses that retain the waters as prisoners. The words for 'cow' and 'fortress' play

¹ "Den kein Ross erreicht".

² The other implies the existence of a word *naśva* = *naśvara*.

³ इन्धन्वन्. Cf. the classical *indhanvant*. The translation of Ludwig, 'flammand', and even that of Grassmann, 'flammenreich' are only approximate.

⁴ The idea of milk is actually expressed in the verses I, 62, 9; 180, 3; that of cows in the verses I, 180, 3; II, 40, 2; III, 30, 14; IV, 3, 9; VI, 17, 6; 44, 24; 72, 4; cf. VIII, 32, 25. The enigma is complete in the verse VIII, 78, 7 only.

⁵ This explanation, which is so simple, has escaped Grassmann who assigns arbitrarily to the word *udhar* the meaning of 'vessel'.

⁶ I, 62, 9; III, 3, 9. Cf. VI, 72, 4; VIII, 82, 13.

⁷ Not to speak of the use of the word उन्धिया I, 180, 3; II, 40, 2; VI, 17, 6, which contains at least an allusion to the Dawn-cows (*Religion Vedique*, I, p. 316), it will be observed that not only do all our formulae celebrate the work of a god putting the cooked milk into the raw cows,

thus the role of veritable equivalents that may replace each other in the mythical formulae, in the same way as the chemical equivalents replace each other in combinations of matter. We have a very curious example of this equivalence in the formula 'raw fortresses', II, 35, 6, which at the same time confirms the application of the formula 'raw cows' to the celestial cows, and specially to the clouds. These fortresses are the abode of Apām Napāt, the son of the waters, that is to say, of the celestial fire who takes the place here of the cooked milk contained in the raw cows. But what is no less curious than the expression itself, is, on the one hand, the manner in which it has been interpreted by Ludwig, and on the other, the manner in which Grassmann has effaced the figure. The former supposes that the 'raw fortresses' are fortresses 'built with raw bricks'. The latter translates 'the sombre fortresses' (sic). He has however, according to an indication given in his dictionary, recognised that the epithet 'raw' of the 'fortress-clouds' is here given to them through apposition to the fire which is born in them. But he does not seem to have understood the relation of this expression with the formula of 'raw cows'. In any case, he has not merely, according to the process of translation which is familiar to him, replaced the idea expressed by the idea suggested : he has replaced it by an idea that is quite strange to the text. ¹ [23]

but that almost all either reveal plainly by some term (पूर्व I, 180, 3, जाम-
येण IV, 3, 9) their mythical character or depict clearly at the same time other works accomplished by the gods in the sky, VIII, 32, 25. Thus such are, in the verse VI, 17, 6 the opening of the doors 'of the sky'; in verse II, 40, 2, the dispersion of darkness; in verse VIII, 78, 7, the rising of the sun. In the verse III, 30, 4, the 'cooked thing' which the 'raw' cow carries is called 'a great light, placed in the entrails'. It may also be observed that the 'cooked thing' placed in the cows receives in verse X, 106, 11 the name of मधु (cf. IV, 3, 9), denoting apparently the same liquor to which the verse III, 39, 6 assigns feet and hoofs, that is to say, the Soma. But there is still better to come. In the verse X, 99, 10, it is under his own name that the Soma is placed in the entrails and in the udder of the cows. Finally, in verse X, 45, 3, we see Agni 'kindled in the udder' of the sky. Cf. below, p. 29.

¹ Similar, too, is the procedure of Ludwig; in the formula of 'raw cows', he replaces the idea of 'raw' by that of 'living', I, 180, 3; III, 30, 14; cf. IV, 3, 9.

The Maruts are, on the one hand, stags, and on the other, priests. They are therefore the stags¹ that 'sing',² I, 165, 1.

Like the Maruts, the companions of Bṛhaspatī are celestial priests. The warm rain of the summer is their sweat. But this rain is also the milk of the sky, and it is a warm milk.³ It can therefore be said that they have 'warm milk as their sweat', X, 67, 7. Those who, in order to avoid this bizarre combination, would uphold the interpretation, which however is uninteresting, of Grassmann and Ludwig, 'perspiring on account of the heat', should first bring this translation into accord with that which the same scholars have given of the verse VII, 103, 8 (cf. 9).

Agni the fire, who is sometimes a sage and sometimes a horse, becomes in verse I, 149, 3 a 'sage horse'. The same Agni is not only the horse that carries to the gods the sacrifice in general and the prayer in particular, he is also the driver who yokes and guides the prayer. The two ideas are combined in the verse I, 65, 1: "(Agni) who yokes the obeisance and who draws the obeisance". Here Grassmann gives the correct meaning, and Ludwig rejects it.

The priests lead by the bridle the horse Agni, IV, 11, 9. But, on the other hand, it is he who impels them, who 'awakens' them. It is therefore said, by mixing up the two figures and by adding to them a metonymy, that he 'awakens the bridle of the troop (of the priests)', V, 1, 3. The translations which Grassmann and Ludwig give of this passage differ as much from each other as they do from mine.⁴

Agni and Soma are both assimilated sometimes to a calf and sometimes to a priest. It is one of these two gods of the sacrifice who is called in the verse VIII, 61, 5 a 'calf' that 'praises' its mother.

¹ In spite of Grassmann and Ludwig and the Pada-pāṭha even, the word एत in a hymn to the Maruts, can only have the meaning of 'stag' or 'antelope'.

² On the meaning attributed to the root *rc* by Grassmann, see *Religion Vedique*, I, p. 277.

³ घर्म Cf. VII, 103, 8 and 9, and *Religion Vedique*, I, p. 292.

⁴ The most improbable one is indisputably that of Ludwig: "Die Kette der lebenden Schaar".

Soma, like Agni, is a horse. To make him flow is to guide a yoked horse. This is the function of the pressing stones that are, however, themselves called males (horses or bulls), either because of their strength, or by way of allusion to the celestial bulls and horses that shed the rain. Soma is therefore a horse yoked by horses (or by bulls¹), IX, 97, 28.

Soma is also an eagle. The vat into which he flows is his garment [24] or his armour.² Thus then we have an eagle that is covered with armour, IX, 67, 14.

We have seen above the sun assimilated with a strainer through which is filtered a Soma who is no other than the light itself of that heavenly body. Elsewhere the rays of the sun become the fingers that filter this same Soma. Now they are also represented under the name of हरित् as mares. There are thus 'ten harits' which 'filter Soma' and make him bright, IX, 38, 3.

The rays of the sun are also arrows. This explains the formula 'Soma filtered by the arrow of the sun', IX, 76, 4. Grassmann has understood this passage whose meaning seems to have totally escaped Ludwig. But he has not perceived some corollaries that can be drawn from it, particularly in the explanation of the metaphor शर्य 'arrow', applied to the fingers that express the sacred beverage, and in that of the word क्षिप्, which is translated as 'finger', but whose real meaning seems likewise to be arrow. There are here, it seems to me, allusions to the fingers that press the solar Soma, that is to say, to the sun's rays assimilated at the same time with arrows. They give rise to a new series of combinations³ whose strangeness is not surpassed by that of the multitude of formulae that we have already studied.

¹ Grassmann and Ludwig avoid the paradox, the former by giving to वृषन्, contrary to all probability, the meaning of 'Mann', the latter by employing the preposition 'mit' instead of 'von' in translating the instrumental, which gives a formula without any definite meaning. Add in the same category of ideas the formulae of the verses IX, 64, 15 and 96, 2, where the horses that 'guide' Soma and the 'bays' that 'curry' the 'bay' are, without doubt, the priests themselves or their fingers.

² Grassmann and Ludwig weaken the expression.

³ See *Religion Vedique*, I, pp. 201-204 and 206-207.

The pressing stones are represented as 'carrying the Soma on their back', VIII, 52, 2. But the Soma himself is represented as a horse. Hence 'the stone that carries the horse on its back', VIII, 26, 24. The two formulae are mixed up by Grassmann in the same translation, 'the stone that carries the Soma'. The second formula thus loses all its force; it is explained but not translated. But this explanation is at least correct. What however can we say of the interpretation that Roth gives in his dictionary of the word अश्वपृष्ठ, 'stone carried on the back of a horse' and of that of Ludwig '(stone) large like the back of a horse'?

The celestial treasures, the waters for instance, are represented sometimes as cows and sometimes as the fruits of a tree. Combining these figures, a poet says to Indra: "Make cows fall for us by shaking (the tree of the sky¹)", I, 10, 8. On the other hand, the falling of the rain is considered as a sowing of the field which it fertilises; and it is said of the Maruts that they [25] sow² the cloud, VIII, 7, 4. But the waters of the clouds are at the same time cows, and the clouds themselves are mountains. We therefore see Br̥haspati, after his victory over the demons, drawing out the 'cows' from the 'mountain' in order to 'sow' them like the corn which is taken from bushels³ of corn, X, 68, 3.

The making of Soma by pressing has been assimilated⁴ to the churning of butter and to the operation, denoted by the same root *manth* 'to churn', of kindling the fire by rubbing. On the other hand, it is, according to a well-known myth, by an

¹ Cf. III, 45, 4. Ludwig's translation: "Raffe uns in Sturm zusammen die Rinder" does not present any definite image. As for Grassmann, he replaces 'shaking' by 'throwing' and 'cows' by 'milk'. On this last point, see below, p. 30ff.

² Here it is Ludwig who removes the metaphor while Grassmann retains it.

³ The meaning of the word स्थिवि is doubtful; but the interpretation of Grassmann, 'Aehre', and that of Ludwig, 'Worfel', are mere conjectures like that of Roth which I have adopted. The latter has at least the advantage of completing a definite, and if I do not err, very satisfying, meaning.

⁴ See in the verse I, 28, 4, the use of a मन्थ (instrument of churning) in the pressing of the Soma.

eagle that Soma has been carried from the sky. Finally, the sky or the cloud, whence the Soma can likewise be taken away, is a mountain. Hence the formula : " The eagle has churned (taken away by churning¹) the Soma from the sky", IX, 77, 2 or 'from the mountain', I, 93, 6. When the Soma is considered as held (i. e., confined) by the demon *Namuci* ' Who-does-not-give-up ' in the most remote portion of the sky which is therefore called the ' head of Namuci ', Indra makes him come out of this ' head ' by ' churning ', in the same way as ' the eagle ' has ' churned ' for him the intoxicating plant², VI, 20, 6.

Regarding the compound हविर्मथि ' that churns³ the offering, ' VII, 104, 21, we can replace it by वज्रमथि applied to Dadhikrāvan in the verse IV, 38, 5, where this mythical horse is compared at the same time to an ' eagle ' and a ' thief ' who ' churns a garment '. The thief is not different from the eagle, and the latter is the carrier of the celestial Soma ; it churns for this Soma the celestial butter, that is to say, the waters of the sky, that become his garment. It is thus that the water mixed with Soma in the preparation of the sacred beverage serves him as a garment, according to a metaphor that has become commonplace in the hymns of Book IX. The allusion to the robbing of the Soma by the eagle appears to have totally escaped Grassmann and also Ludwig.

Finally, a third compound, उरामथि ' that churns the sheep, ' is in verse VIII, 55, 8, the epithet of the wolf ' that observes the rites [26] of Indra '. This sheep and this wolf can be no other than the Soma and the pressing stone⁴. It is the sacrificer himself who is compared with the wolf in a verse of the Athar-

¹ On the Vedic uses of the root *manth* and on the possibility of bringing all these uses under the meaning of ' to churn ', see *Religion Vedique*, III, p. 7 and note 3.

² I do not know through what construction Grassmann could have arrived at the translation that he gives of this passage. Ludwig translates correctly, but he has committed the mistake of abandoning, as does Grassmann, the radical meaning of the root *manth*.

³ This meaning is placed beyond doubt by the parallel epithet अविवांसत्. The Yātus there are the enemy sacrificers.

⁴ Regarding the role of the wolf in the Soma myths, see *Religion Vedique*, III, pp. 7-10 and note 3.

vaveda, V, 8, 4, where the priest, when praying to the gods to spare the life of his client, seeks, like the author of the verse II, 28, 5 of the R̥gveda, to interest them by means of the consideration of the sacrifices which a living man could offer to them: "May he, living, churn the sheep like a wolf". In the verse VIII, 2, 2, the formula concerning Soma, which is translated as 'pressed by the stones', signifies perhaps literally 'pressed by the wolves'. In fact, the word अश्व to which Grassmann and Ludwig, following Roth, give in this passage alone the meaning of 'stone', signifies etymologically 'devouring', and is elsewhere used as an epithet of a demoniacal animal.

If now, we bear in mind that the falling of the rain is considered as the sowing of a field which it fertilises, and if we consider, on the one hand, that the rain which falls from the sky contains the celestial Soma whose direct action on the crops¹, is, however, also established by many texts, we shall understand that the 'wolf' representing the celestial pressing may become the instrument by means of which the Ásvins 'sow', I, 117, 21, or according to another expression, 'plough'² VIII, 22, 6, the field of corn. Thus becomes futile a hypothesis which is however very ancient since it goes back to the *Nirukta*, according to which, in these two passages³, the word *vr̥ka* 'wolf' signifies 'plough'.

Like the prayer in general, the hymns, the verses, are cows. The verses have feet, but these feet are eight in number. Hence the cows with eight feet, II, 7. 5. For Ludwig, the cows with eight feet are the pregnant cows; but is not the epithet अष्टपदी (having eight feet) in the verse VIII, 65, 12, expressly given to speech itself? Grassmann interprets the words as I do, but translates differently by understanding the word 'verse'.

¹ *Religion Vedique*, III, p. 9, note 1.

² Cf. I, 23, 15: Pūṣan, with the drops of Soma, has 'realised' six yoked (oxen) and has 'ploughed, as it were, the field of corn' with these oxen.

³ In these two passages only! In passages which evidently speak of a mythical ploughing and sowing, since the ploughers and sowers are the Ásvins! For a more complete argumentation of this point, see *Religion Vedique*, III, p. 9, note 1.

We have seen that the composition of the hymns is compared to the purification of the Soma. By combining this figure with that which assimilates the sacrifice to a textile woven by the priests [27] on a warp, we obtain the formula: "The warp of the sacrifice is stretched on a strainer at the point of the tongue by Varuṇa's puissance", IX, 73, 9. It is in fact Varuṇa who confers wisdom and eloquence, I, 105, 15. The words वरुणस्य मायया form a well-known phrase and one should not therefore detach, as does Ludwig, the genitive वरुणस्य from it and attach it to जिह्वायाः. As for the translation of Grassmann: 'at the commencement of the sacrifice', it is futile to discuss it.

The prayer is the wife of Indra. But it is also a lowing cow. Indra has therefore a 'wife' that 'lows' after him, IV, 24, 8. The commentary which Grassmann gives to his translation of this passage proves that he has not understood its real meaning.

The prayers are weapons, arrows. The priests are bulls. Hence the 'bulls' yoked to the yoke of the sacrifice who have 'arrows' in the 'mouth' and who hit the 'heart', I, 84, 16. Ludwig has understood that this expression denotes the priests. Why then has he not seen that in the verse, II, 24, 8, the 'arrows' discharged from the bow of Brahmanaspati, who has the sacrifice¹ 'for his string', these arrows that have 'the ear for womb'², are the prayers?

The prayer is not only the weapon of the gods; it is also, according to a figure no less familiar to the Vedic r̥sis, a garment which is put on them. It is the combination of these two figures that explains the following formula addressed to Indra: "Thou hast hit the enemies with beautiful garments", VI, 33, 3. Despite the manuscripts of the *Nighaṇṭus* which give अत्क (instead of अर्क which however has the meaning of hymn only) among

¹ Neither Grassmann nor Ludwig has understood the word ऋतय.

² And not, 'that are brought back in the rear up to the ear' as understood by Grassmann, and without doubt by Ludwig also. The poet indicates thus the *provenance* of the prayers that are collected by *oral tradition*.

the names of the lightning, I venture to maintain against Grassmann and Ludwig that this word can have no other meaning but 'garment'.

Every danger is a river or a sea to be crossed over and the instrument of salvation is the ship. This metaphor is so commonly used that a poet in begging Agni for the salvation of his chariot (in the war) and of his house (during peace) implores him for a 'ship for his chariot and for his house', and in order that this ship may more quickly transport his house and his chariot over the ocean of danger, he wishes that it may have 'feet', I, 140, 12. Grassmann and Ludwig weaken this last trait in a translation that is however accurate as regards the rest and, in consequence, already noticeably strange. The scruple has here taken hold of them somewhat late.

The god himself, the saviour god Indra, is a 'ship' that [28] the priests make use of by yoking (like a horse) 'to the yoke' of their 'hymn', I, 131, 2. Ludwig obliterates all the force of this formula. Grassmann gives, like him, to the word शूष 'hymn' the meaning 'force'; but he goes further by making a pile (sic) of the 'yoke', *dhur*.

TRIPLE AND QUADRUPLE GALIMATIAS.

I do not believe that I can characterise better than by this title the formulæ similar to those that follow.

Indra is the son of the sky and of the earth. But Indra is a bull, the sky and the earth are two couples, and in the mythical language of the Rgveda all generation is readily compared to the work of Tvastṛ 'the carpenter'. It is said therefore that "the two couples have carpentered the bull", VIII, 50, 2. Grassmann¹ who substitutes for the three figures the ideas which they represent, translates, if it can be called translation, as "the worlds have engendered the strong one".

The prayer is of celestial origin; it is the sister of the gods, VII, 23, 2; VIII, 12, 31. But it is also a weapon, either in the

¹ Ludwig does not admit the meaning 'couple' for विषणा; see p. 20, note 1.

hands of men or in those of the gods. This latter idea is one of those most familiar to the Vedic poets. Combining this with the preceding one and using a word recalling the natural meaning, one arrives at the formula 'saying of sister-weapons', which is met with in the verses VIII, 6, 3 and X, 8, 7. The greatest mistake of Grassmann and specially of Ludwig in their translations of these two passages has been their neglect or misunderstanding of the complete comparison.

Nor, moreover, have they seen their connection with another formula,¹ 'he has caused the brother bow to glow', VIII, 61, 4, where the prayer-weapon is more implicitly compared to the fire. The addition of this new image can be explained the better inasmuch as the god referred to here is Agni.

The celestial Soma comes out of the cloud. The cloud is a cow. Soma is a hero or a horse; or rather Soma is a 'liquor' that has 'feet'², that has 'hoofs', and that Indra finds in the 'cow', III, 39, 6. The waters of the sky are sometimes the milk of a celestial cow [29] and sometimes are themselves cows. Hence the 'cows' that come out of an 'udder', and what is stranger, from the 'udder of a male', as a consequence of the confusion of the figures which make the cloud sometimes a male and sometimes a female: "He (Agni) knew how to find,³ when being born, the udder⁴ of his father; he made streams to run from it, the cows⁵", III, 1, 9.

¹ Ludwig gives to this formula too a translation that is quite fantastic: "Die Doppelfläche hat er in Brand gesetzt".

² The words गुहा हितं etc., that follow in the verse seem to indicate plainly that there is only one thing spoken of here, only one object, denoted by the substantive मधु and by the adjective पृद्धत् and शफवत्. In any case, Ludwig's translation 'durch die Fuss (spuren)', etc., is hardly admissible.

³ Doubtless, it is through inadvertence that Ludwig confounds *viveda* with *veda*.

⁴ Grassmann seems as if he would conceal the paradox by the equivocal word 'Busen'; Ludwig translates very well as 'Euter'.

⁵ Regarding घेना (Grassmann, 'Trank', Ludwig, 'Stimme'), see below, p. 31, notes 1 and 2.

This formula, moreover, is not an isolated one. In the verse IV, 22, 6, are again spoken of the 'cows' which come from the 'udder' of the 'male'. In this passage, Ludwig, overcome by a scruple which did not make him halt in the preceding one, replaces the expression 'udder of the male' by 'the udder that rains.' Grassmann retains the expression 'udder of the male', but transforms the 'cows' into 'milk'.

The mixing up of the cows and of milk is implicit in many other formulae beginning with this: "To milk the cows out of obscurity", I, 33, 10, for 'make them come out'. But this observation can be generalised. This is what I am going to do in the next paragraph after citing an example of what I call 'quadruple galimatias'.

The celestial fire, sun or lightning, or the Soma who is identical with the fire in these forms, is sometimes the 'calf' and sometimes the 'cooked' and resplendent milk of the 'raw' celestial cow. It is also a 'sluggard' when it lingers in an abode that is more or less confounded with the cow itself and is also called, in allusion to the malevolent forces which retain the celestial treasures, the abode of 'deceit'. These different figures are combined in verse 3 of a hymn, X, 79, which however almost exclusively contains enigmas. The verse concerns the action exercised on the celestial fire or Soma by the terrestrial fire 'seeking the hidden retreat of its mother', and says: "He' found like a sluggard the brilliant cooked one sucking in the lap of deceit".

METAPHORICAL USES OF THE WORD गो 'COW'

The word गो whose usual meaning is 'cow' has, according to the majority of interpreters, [30] become in current usage

¹ Grassmann and Ludwig suppose, contrary to all probability and particularly to the interpretation adopted by Ludwig for the first hemistich, that the subject of the verb *avidat* is the 'mother'. Regarding the meaning of the word *rip*, cf. रिप and see *Religion Vedique*, III, p. 179. Ludwig makes

रिप: an accusative plural without taking into account similar formulae where this word figures always as a genitive singular. Grassmann gives to it the meaning 'earth' which nothing justifies. Concerning the meaning that I assign to the word सुस, see the myth of the slumber of the Rbhus in Savitr's abode, that is to say, in the invisible world.

by a sort of metonymy the name of different products like the milk of the cow or the butter made from this milk, the skin made from the hide of the same animal, and the straps or the bow-string made of this skin. It is indisputable in fact that the same word which in certain passages denotes either real cows or mythical cows - Dawns, waters, prayers, offerings, serves also to denote the cowhide on which the Soma juice is extracted, the straps of the chariot, the string of the bow, and above all the butter sacrificed in the fire or the milk mixed with the sacred beverage. But it denotes these different objects like offerings of all sorts, prayers, waters and the Dawns, only because they are, in the phraseology of the hymns, either regularly or accidentally assimilated to cows. The figure is less a metonymy than a metaphor. It is also very probable that it is a purely mythical and liturgical figure and not a popular one. Finally, and this point is the most important, it is always a figure that is felt as such and has not become a current appellation. Neither the archers nor the drivers, nor the women that milked, of the Vedic period gave, I believe, to the strings of their bows, to the straps of their chariots or to their milk, the name of 'cow'. And in any case to substitute according to the occasion the words 'milk', 'straps', 'strings' for 'cows' as the lexicographers and translators have done is to interpret the text rather than to translate it; it is to interpret the text so as to remove from it the mythical colour which ought to form the principal interest for us.

They retain nevertheless this colour in more than one passage. Grassmann in his *Woerterbuch* has remarked that the word *go*, in the plural, often denotes the drops of milk conceived as the cows towards which rushes the bull Soma. He and Ludwig translate correctly many formulae, like that in the verse IX, 97, 13 for instance, where Soma is represented as a bull bellowing after the cows. There is in it an allusion to the union of the celestial Soma with the Dawns or the waters of the sky, those other cows¹ whose milk is one of those represented in the operations of the cult. This allusion is the *raison d'être* of the metaphor; and it would furnish the justification in a multitude of passages in which Grassmann and Ludwig have

¹ Cf. IX, 96, 7.

felt that they ought to replace the figurative word by the unfigurative one.

It is necessary however, even in the formulae whose details are in accord with the metaphor, that the translators should at all times be consistent with themselves. Grassmann, on the other hand, in the verse IX, 96, 14, shows us Soma 'united with the milk' although [31] the epithet 'bellowing' given to the male beverage should have induced him to keep the name 'cow' for the female beverage. This is what Ludwig has done in this passage. On the other hand, in another, still more decisive passage, in which Grassmann translates correctly as 'like a man who goes to meet a woman at the rendezvous, he unites himself with the cows in the vat', IX, 93, 2, Ludwig has deemed it proper to translate 'he has united himself with the milk'.

Nor is this all. In these two passages, the word which expresses the idea of 'cow' and suggests the idea of 'milk', is not *go'* but उक्षिया. Now it would in the first place be difficult to admit, in the formulae in which it is the word *go'* that denotes the milk, a complete forgetfulness of the original signification that is still so vividly felt in other similar formulae, and to the allusion to which the metaphor, in my opinion, owes its origin. But it is still more difficult to conceive of a similar effacement of the meaning in many synonyms at the same time. I say 'many', and in fact, to the words *go'* and उक्षिया Grassmann and Ludwig add the word धेनु and the former the word धेना¹ also as the names of the cow that have parallelly become capable of denoting 'milk' without any figure.

¹ Ludwig gives to this word the meaning 'voice, hymn', and the *Nighantus* do in fact include it among the synonyms of *vāc*. The truth is, however, that it can have, like धेनु, only the meaning 'cow' which is sufficiently established for it by its etymology, and by a formula like that of the verse V, 62, 2, 'the cows of the stable', but that, like the other names of the cow, it can denote and does in fact sometimes denote, the prayers. Thus in the verse X, 104, 10, the 'cow' that 'implores' Indra is certainly the prayer; cf. VII, 94, 4 and X, 104, 3. But elsewhere, the word धेना denotes other forms of the mythical or liturgical cow, for instance, the celestial waters; see below.

Of the different instances of a similar use of the word **धेनु** which are found cited in Grassmann's *Woerterbuch*, two only¹ deserve to be mentioned, and have, in fact, been already mentioned above. In one, the 'river' that contains all the 'cows', IV, 19, 6, is, we have seen, the river that contains all the waters.² In the other, III, 1, 9, the reader who can willingly accept Ludwig's 'udder of the father', will not, I hope, make too much difficulty in admitting, with me, that this 'udder' from which Agni comes is not that of the milk but of the 'cows'.³

In a formula almost identical with the verse IV, 22, 6, the [32] 'cows' that 'flow out' from the 'udder of the male' are denoted by the word **धेनु** and here Ludwig bravely keeps the word 'cows', for which Grassmann substitutes 'milk'. Elsewhere it is on the contrary Ludwig who substitutes for the figurative word the unfigurative one, while Grassmann, at least in his translation, reverts to the meaning 'cows' in the case of the word **धेनु**. This passage which speaks of the 'foregathering' of Soma with the 'cows' represented as beautiful women, IX, 61, 21, brings us to the formulae concerning the sacred beverage.

In the verse IX, 72, 1, the word **धेनु** denotes again the 'cows' with which Soma is anointed in the vat. The same formula is many times repeated with the word *go*. This combination has displeased Grassmann and Ludwig who have everywhere substituted the word 'milk' for 'cows'. This is the case with the passages where the vat⁴ is explicitly mentioned, IX, 85, 5; 86, 47; 96, 22. But in others, IX, 45, 3; 50, 5; 103, 2; 107, 22, there is room for doubt if the 'unguent'⁵ in question is that of the

¹ Regarding VII, 94, 4, and X, 104, 3, see the preceding note. It is possible that in the verse VII, 24, 2, the word **धेनु** likewise denotes the prayers. It certainly denotes in the verse 11th 58, 6, the prayers assimilated with the offerings of butter (see above, p. 14). In the verses VIII, 32, 22 and X, 43, 6, the context is not such as to enable us to determine the meaning.

² P. 18. This is, for the rest, the interpretation of Grassmann in his translation; only, he has suppressed the figure.

³ P. 29.

⁴ It is said of the vat itself that it is, 'anointed with the cows', IV, 27; 5; IX, 74, 8.

⁵ See particularly IX, 50, 5.

milk or of 'the prayers'. For, the Vedic priests 'anoint', for instance, Indra and Viṣṇu with the 'unguent of prayers', VI, 69, 3, as they 'anoint' Mitra and Varuṇa with 'cows', I, 151, 8. On the other hand, the prayer¹ of the Sobharis is 'anointed with cows' by the Maruts, VIII, 20, 8, that is to say, without doubt rewarded with cows. In brief this metaphor of the 'unguent' is commonplace in the hymns for expressing an enhancement of splendour. The gods take on a new splendour through the prayers, the prayers through the cows that are their reward, and the Soma likewise through the cows, which may represent the hymns chanted in his honour or the milk with which he is mixed. In the verse IX, 10, 5, the comparison 'the Somas are anointed with cows as kings with praises' suggests rather the identification of the cows with the prayers. But even in those places where milk is spoken of, the milk is denoted only by a figurative expression whose plain meaning is 'cow', and the unguent of cows should arrest the attention of the reader if only because of the bizarre combinations of words with which he is already familiar. The prayers however and even the milk are no more a real unguent than the cows, and if my translation of the verse IX, 32, 3: "He is anointed with cows like a horse" is paradoxical, that of Grassmann "He is anointed with milk like a horse" is unmeaning.

One might think that it is the butter that serves as unguent. None the less, I translate the second pāda of the verse V, 1, 3, which can [33] in fact be applied to the sacrificial butter, on the analogy of the formulae already cited, as 'Agni, brilliant, is anointed with brilliant cows'.² And I have the less scruple in doing so inasmuch as the verse begins with another bizarre formula already cited above, "He has awakened the bridle of the troop", and ends in the same paradoxical style.

Moreover according to an observation that has also been made above, the mere fact of the change in the terms गो and धेनु in the formula 'to anoint with the cows' should be a reason to keep this word 'cows' for which Grassmann and Ludwig have

¹ Or the music? वृण. I do not know whence Ludwig gets the meaning 'Zapfen'.

² Cf. V, 3, 2. Cf. also X, 31, 4.

substituted the word 'milk'. The same argument could be applied in the case of the formula 'cooked by the cows'¹ where too these two interpreters have made the same substitution. But here it is sufficient to oppose them to themselves and to point out the inconsistency which they commit in translating in certain passages, VIII, 2, 3; 71, 5; IX, 46, 4; 107, 2; 109, 15 and 17, as 'cooked with milk'² a formula which in other passages, where the idea of 'milk' is expressed at the same time as that of 'cows', VIII, 58, 3; IX, 84, 5, they have themselves been obliged to translate as 'cooked by the cows'.³

Further though it is shown by these passages and others also where the formula is in fact 'cooked with milk' or 'cooked with curdled milk', VIII, 2, 9; IX, 11, 6, that the cows that cook the Soma can represent the milk with which he is mixed, it does not necessarily follow that these cows represent the milk only. And in fact, we read in the verse IX, 84, 5 that the cows cook the Soma with their milk 'and with their prayers'.

That is, 'to cook the Soma' does not mean to cook him materially as believed by Grassmann who understands this formula as referring to 'hot' milk. The cows that represent the milk or the prayers can be considered as 'cooking' the Soma

¹ The word घेनु is used in the verses I, 84, 11; IX, 1, 9; 86, 17.

² In his translation Grassmann says simply 'mixed with the milk', as if he had abandoned the meaning which he had adopted in his *Woerterbuch* for the root *śri* and reverted to that of Roth. Elsewhere however, he keeps to this meaning, or rather, only modifies it into that of 'heat', 'to heat', VIII, 58, 3; IX, 86, 17, cf. 84, 5. Finally it will be seen below that the verse IX, 93, 3 suggests to him the meaning of 'covering up the hot milk'. In the verse IX, 71, 4, he prefers the meaning 'to anoint'. This is really too much to pass by without comment. For the rest, he has already in his *Woerterbuch* translated the compound गोधीत^d as 'mixed with milk'. I translate it as 'cooked with cows', as I do गवाशिर् a possessive compound whose second word आशिर् whether used by itself or in other compounds, should signify 'that which serves for cooking', that is to say, for making perfect the offering.

³ Ludwig translates thus the verses IX, 71, 4 and 93, 3 also, and Grassmann, the verse IX, 86, 17, with the exception that he attenuates the meaning of 'to cook' into that of 'to make hot'. In this verse Ludwig connects the verb *asīrayuḥ* with the root *śri* 'to go towards'.

because they complete the preparation in the same way as a real cooking [34] completes the preparation of the other offerings. But this expression contains chiefly an allusion to the celestial Soma, to the sun or to the lightning 'cooked' in the 'raw' cows, that is, in the Nights, Dawns or clouds. This is so much the case that in the verse I, 84, 11, the cows that cook¹ the Soma receive not only the name वेनदः but also पृश्नयः which moreover is alone used to denote them in the verse VIII, 58, 3 and evokes already by itself the idea of the clouds that is symbolised by the well-known Práni, although the passages in question do not, as we shall see, lay stress on the idea of the celestial cows. In the first place, these cows are called the cows of Indra that accompany him and drink the liquor (of the offering), *ibid.* 10. I translate the second thus: "For him (Indra), at his birth, the cows that give sweet milk, the races of the god cook the Soma in the three brilliant spaces of the sky".² We read also in the verse IX, 71, 4, that the cows which 'eat the offering' cook the Soma 'in their udder', and 'at the head', that is to say, in the most elevated portion, of the sky.³ In the verse IX, 93, 3, the 'head' is the Soma himself of this supreme world, although the cows that cook him are 'in the vats'.⁴ It is without doubt the action of the terrestrial sacrifice on the celestial Soma that is spoken of here.

The Soma 'cooked by the cows' is at the same time considered

1 Grassmann writes 'mixed with Soma'.

2 My construction is the same as that of Ludwig. That of Grassmann seems certainly to be unnatural. The meaning which he extracts from the passage is moreover without any interest.

3 Grassmann interprets, without however explaining the meaning further, 'an dem Euter rechte Opfer nehmend', and replaces without any ado the idea of 'to cook' with that of 'to anoint' at the head. It is the word ऊधर which Ludwig attacks. He changes the meaning of 'udder' into that of 'reservoir'. But he too does not tell us what he understands by the cows that cook the Soma 'on their head'.

4 Ludwig translates correctly but without determining the application of the word 'head'. Grassmann substitutes the idea of 'covering' (sic) to that of 'cooking'.

as the calf of the same cows. It is therefore said: "The cows cook this Soma who is their young one", ¹ IX, 1, 9.

The 'purification' of the Soma by the 'cows' is certainly no more strange than the 'cooking' which they perform in respect of the sacred beverage. In the verse IX, 43, 1 however the Soma purified by the cows is compared to a horse. Now it is probable that the grooms of the Vedic period made use neither of milk nor of cows when currying their horses. The parallelism of the words अग्निः and गोभिः in the verse IX, 68, 9 is no reason to translate 'purified with the waters and with milk'. We have [35] mentioned above ² examples of such parallel construction of the figurative and unfigurative words, and there are many others. To the same two words the verse IX, 91, 2 adds also अविभिः; and here again, the bringing together of the two figurative words is one more reason for translating 'purified by the cows' at the same time as 'purified by the sheep'. The sheep represent, as we know, the strainer of wool.

I do not lay equal stress on all the formulae where the figurative word 'cows' has been abandoned by the interpreters and replaced by the plain 'milk'. In some, ³ it would be difficult to

¹ Ludwig searches for a too subtle explanation of the word शिशु which denotes, according to him, the Soma newly prepared. As for Grassmann, he replaces the idea of 'cooking' with that of 'mixing with hot milk' in this translation which is moreover quite as bizarre as the correct one: "The cows mix the hot milk with the calf".

² P. 16 and note 3.

³ See regarding the word घेनु, I, 125, 4; VIII, 2, 6; IX, 66, 6, and regarding the word गो, I, 134, 2; III, 35, 8; IX, 64, 13. Add the following compounds, namely, गविष्, which in the verse X, 76, 7 refers to Soma himself rather than to the prayers; गोपरीणस्, VIII, 45, 24; गोपीय, which in the verse I, 19, 1 can very well signify 'protection' as in the other verses in which it is employed; गोर्भस्, I, 121, 8; गोविन्दु, IX, 96, 19, and the derivative गोमत् in the expression सुतस्य गोमत्, VIII, 3, 1; 13, 14,; 71, 6; 81, 13; 83, 6. Regarding the compound गविष्टि, IX, 66, 15, and the derivatives gavyu', IX, 97, 15 and go'mat in

discover any particular reason which could have led them to the decision to make such a substitution. In others, I, 95, 8; IX, 97, 45 and 24, 2, the observation made just now about the parallelism of the figurative and the unfigurative words or the one that was made at the commencement of this article on 'inverse' comparisons is sufficient to explain the use of the word 'cows'. The expression 'adorned with cows', IX, 61, 13, is but an attenuation of the expression 'anointed with cows'. Finally, there are cases where substitution of the word 'milk' is doubly defective. Thus, although it can be said of milk, as also of cows, that it is 'milked', it is quite evident that the application of this epithet to a word whose original meaning is in any case 'cow', does not allow of its being translated, in the verse IX, 107, 9, by the word 'milk', as has been done by Grassmann. The translation which the same scholar gives of the verse IX, 84, 3 disconcerts the reader who has the text before his eyes. Being unable to say that the Soma flows 'into' the plants 'with the milk', he says that he 'comes out of it', translating without any ado a locative like an ablative. In reality, the verse speaks of the celestial Soma entering into the plants with the 'cows' that are here the waters of the sky.¹ In the verse IX, 6, 6, the epithet 'male' given to the Soma juice has led Grassmann to the decision [36 to leave the name 'cows' to the milk with which Soma is mixed.² But Ludwig, on the contrary, substitutes, very inappropriately, the plain word for the figurative one. Finally, it is difficult to

the expressions वाजं गोमन्तं, IX, 33, 2; 63, 14, cf. Vāl. 1, 9, and गोमतीरिषः I, 98, 15; V, 79, 8; VIII, 5, 9; VIII, 23, 29; IX, 62, 24 (cf. घेनुमस्यै इषे I, 120, 9), it is sufficient for me to oppose Ludwig to Grassmann, and regarding the compound गोव्योघसु, IX, 97, 10 Grassmann (translation) to Ludwig. There are some compounds that are difficult to explain. Regarding गोव्योघसु, that has an ocean of cows', see above p. 21 and note 1. As for गोव्योघसु, I have translated it as 'haying the cow for arrow', *Religion Vedique*, I, p. 206.

¹ See *Religion Vedique*, I, p. 172.

² Only he commits the mistake of covering up the baldness of the metaphor by introducing a particle of comparison to which there is nothing corresponding in the text.

understand why Grassmann and Ludwig have both preferred to give Soma for 'friend' the 'milk' rather than the 'cow', V, 37, 4.

I hasten now to take up a new series of formulae whose examination will be successful, I hope, in proving that the word *go'* never denotes 'milk' directly, and without figure. It is often said that Soma 'puts on, as if it were, something', IX, 14, 5; 107, 26, or without any attenuating particle, that he 'puts on a garment of cows', IX, 86, 26; 95, 1; that he 'attires himself', II, 36, 1; IX, 2, 4; 14, 3; 42, 1; 66, 13; 107, 18, and that 'he is attired', in cows IX, 8, 5, that his 'colour'¹ is attired with cows, IX, 104, 4, that he is 'enveloped with cows', IX, 86, 27. Grassmann turns the dress of 'cows' into one of 'milk'. This too is a costume that is very unusual; but one can only do what one can, and Vedic thought, in spite of it, refuses to allow itself to be dressed wholly according to the mode of the day.

Ludwig proceeds most frequently like Grassmann. However, in the verses IX, 107, 26 and 86, 26, his translation shows us Soma taking, as in the text, the 'cows' for garment, or according to the expression that he substitutes for the latter in the verse IX, 86, 26, for 'covering'. It seems thus as if it is less through repugnance than through indifference for the Vedic figure that he substitutes 'milk' for 'cows' in the majority of passages. In reality, the toilets of Soma are as bizarre as they are varied, and form the strangest masquerade.² His 'white', IX, 107, 13, or 'bright', IX, 69, 4, garments can, without doubt, represent the milk, and the Vedic poets give his other liquid costumes also, melted butter, IX, 82, 2, and the waters, II, 36, 1; IX, 2, 3; 42, 1; 70, 2; 96, 13; 107, 4 and 18; 109, 21. But in addition he attires himself with the wool-strainer through which he is filtered, IX, 101, 15, or, according to the expression of the verse I, 98, 2, with the armour of the sheep, and with the vats into which he flows,

¹ In the verse IX, 105, 4, it is conversely said: "I have stretched thy brilliant colour on the cows". Cf. also the use of the derivative गव्य 'belonging to the cow' in the similar expressions of VIII, 1, 17 and IX, 8, 6.

² The metaphor of 'garment' has like that of 'unction' other applications also. It is said of Indra rewarding the hymn that he 'attires' it with riches, VI, 35, 1, etc.

IX, 90, 2, with the fingers that express him, IX, 97, 12, and the laws, *ibid.*, that is to say, with the rites according to which he is prepared. He is also dressed with 'chants', IX, 35, 5, cf. IX, 71, 1, [37] and 99, 1; and this naturally is the occasion to repeat in connection with the figure of 'attiring' what we have already said in connection with 'anointing' and 'cooking': in this new series of formulae, as in the preceding ones, the cows can often represent the prayers that accompany the preparation of the sacred beverage as also the milk with which it is mixed.

The figure of 'cooking' is however combined with that of 'attiring' in the verse IX, 75, 5 which represents Soma as attired in the आशिर् that is to say, in that which 'cooks' him. I do not lay stress on other combinations like 'he attires himself in rivers' as 'king', IX, 89, 2, etc. It is known that such incoherences abound in the Vedic hymns and particularly in the hymns to Soma. They are also met with therefore naturally in many of the formulae in which blooms already this singular flower of rhetoric, the 'garment of cows'. Soma attired in cows is, in the verse IX, 86, 26, called a sage, and compared to a horse, when he flows through the wool (of the strainer). In the verse II, 36, 1, he is 'milked' with the 'stones' and the 'sheep', these sheep, which represent the strainer, appear again in the verse IX, 8, 5: " When he passes through the sheep, we attire him in cows ".

But we have not finished our survey of Soma's wardrobe. He has a triple garment, IX, 108, 12, in the same way as he has three forms corresponding to the three worlds. Not only has he a garment that touches the sky, IX, 86, 14, but he takes for garment the sky itself, IX, 69, 5 or the four cardinal points, IX, 70, 1, and the cloud, IX, 83, 5, cf. 71, 1.

The reader sees now what should be thought of this translation of the verse IX, 86, 27: " The fingers purify him covered with milk, on the third summit, in the brilliant space of the sky." The repugnance of Grassmann and the indifference of Ludwig to the figure in whose favour I have undertaken this long pleading make their eyes blind here to the evidence. In fact, it is patently clear that the cows with which Soma is covered in the

sky, when he is there purified by the fingers of a divine sacrificer, represent the celestial waters.

But this is not all : this formula concerning the celestial Soma gives us the key to the similar formulae employed in connection with the beverage of the terrestrial sacrifice. The cows, milk or prayers, with which Soma is there attired, represent the waters of the cloud which he himself puts on in his superior forms. ¹ It is also said [38] that Soma clothes himself with the vats as Varuna with rivers, IX, 90, 2.

If the reader can still have any doubts about the meaning of the figure and also about the necessity of keeping it always intact in the translations, I hope that they will be removed by a last quotation. The bull with three horns that is spoken of in the verse V, 43, 13 is either identical with Soma, considered in the unity of his triple form, or in any case, is represented as could be Soma himself, called in the verse IX, 56, 32, the husband of the women, going to the rendezvous. Now this bull 'attires himself with women' as Soma attires himself with cows. The women and the cows play therefore in the figure of the 'garment' the role of those mythical equivalents that replace each other, as we have already seen more than once, in the manner of chemical equivalents. Now the word 'women' can on occasion denote the sacrificial milk, but it does so evidently because the latter represents the divine women, that is to say, the celestial waters. Does the reader now want to know how Grassmann and Ludwig have acquitted themselves in the matter of verse V, 43, 13? In the formula 'attired with cows', they substitute the idea of 'milk' for that of 'cows'. Being unable to have recourse to the same substitution in the case of the new formula, it is the idea 'garment' which they attack, by translating 'surrounded by women' or 'dwelling with the women'. To point out such expedients is to pass judgment on them.

It now remains for us to examine the passages where the inter-

¹ Similarly, in the ceremony of the burning of the corpse, the butter, denoted by the word 'cows', which covers the dead man and is to protect him from the heat of the fire, X, 16, 7, represents without doubt the waters of the sky where he has to take on a new life.

preters have substituted for the word 'cows', not 'milk', but the words 'cow-hide', 'straps' or 'bow-strings'.

We read in the verse X, 94, 9 that the pressing stones are placed 'on the cow', and in the verse X, 116, 4 that the beverage has been pressed 'in the cow'. Inconsistent with themselves, Ludwig and Grassmann, the latter changing the idea not only from one passage to another but from his *Woerterbuch* to his translation, have translated in turns, the former 'cowhide' and 'milk', and the latter, 'cowhide', 'cow', and 'leather bottle'. I translate 'cow'¹ and I intend 'cowhide'. The cowhide on which the Soma juice is expressed² should, like the milk with which it is mixed, represent the celestial cow, that is to say, the cloud which envelopes him in the sky, or, in a sphere of ideas less directly naturalistic, the mysterious abode of the cow, प॒दं गोः, that is also called the abode of the bird (Agni or Soma), प॒दं वेः.

[39] It is this same abode or the cloud that is alluded to in the verse I, 121, 9, according to which, Indra, in the opinion of Roth, Grassmann and Ludwig who are all in agreement here, 'hurled' the bolt with a 'sling'. The text signifies in reality that he has 'caused to come back', that is to say, that he has withdrawn, his bolt, 'from the cow'.

From the imaginary sling, we pass on now to the straps of the chariot. The author of the verse VIII, 48, 5, wishing to express the salutary and vivifying effect of the sacred beverage, says that the Somas that he has drunk have 'bound' him in his joints, as the 'cows' bind a 'chariot'. It seems evident that here, the word 'cows' denotes in fact the straps of the chariot. But is it necessary to translate 'straps', as Grassmann and Ludwig do, or should one translate 'cows' as I propose?

The hymn VI, 47 will furnish us with the answer to this question. We see there invoked in the verses 26-28 a chariot, which may be, if one so likes, a real one, but which represents in any case the celestial chariot or lightning, since in the verses 27 and 28 it receives the name 'Indra's bolt'. The qualification

¹ This word is not the most bizarre expression of the verse X, 116, 4. See above, p. 13.

² Cf. IX, 70, 7.

which is applied to it in verse 26 and which Grassmann and Ludwig translate as 'bound with straps' would already be one reason for us to keep the word 'cows', as the cows are capable of representing the waters in which the lightning is enveloped in the sky. But what is decisive is that in verse 27 the same chariot is in fact represented by a slight modification of the formula as 'enveloped' in the cows. This is exactly the qualification that we have seen applied above to the celestial Soma. At the same time, moreover, when our chariot receives in this verse the name 'Indra's bolt', it is also called 'the strength of the waters'. It seems as if the poet has foreseen the embarrassment that he would cause to his interpreters and has therefore accumulated hints calculated to extricate them. They have not sufficed for the interpreters¹: I hope they will be sufficient for the reader.

Thus the straps of the chariot are called cows because they allude to the cows, that is to say, to the waters that envelope the lightning, the war-chariot that on the earth overcomes the enemy representing the lightning that overcomes the demons in the sky. The bizarrerie however of the metaphor which seems to be at its height in the formula 'bound with cows', is found weakened in another metaphor denoting the chariot itself. This latter receives the name 'tree', in such a way that the complete expression suggests the idea of a tree to which cows are fastened.

The same idea is met with in a verse of the *Atharva-veda*, [40] I, 2, 3, where the 'cows' denote, not the straps of the chariot, but bowstrings. The poet however says in it of the 'cows' fastened to the 'tree' that they 'sing' the 'arrow' when shooting it. The reference here is to the incantations of the enemy whose effect Indra is begged to avert. The idea of magical formulae and the figures of the cow and the arrow that are so often applied to hymns are in this verse combined in the most bizarre manner.

In the verse X, 27, 22 of the *Rgveda*, we read: "The cow fastened to different trees has lowed; it is from it that fly away the

¹ Grassmann continues to translate 'enveloped in straps'. Ludwig does better: he translates as Grassmann proposed to do in his *Woerterbuch*: 'enveloped in milk' (sic). He does not however seem to apply this expression to the chariot. His translation is not very intelligible.

birds that devour men". Here the cow is perhaps the cloud from which proceed the lightnings¹. The ideas of the bow, the string, and the arrows are however suggested less by the text itself than by the comparison with the passage previously cited² and with another where the arrows are similarly represented as birds. I refer to the verse VI, 46, 14 already cited above³, in which we have seen the horses compared to rivers⁴. The same horses are there compared also to birds, held 'with the arms' on the 'bow', and hurling themselves 'on the flesh'. These birds are evidently the arrows that proceed from the bow-string that is called a cow because it represents the cow-cloud, whence proceeds the arrow-bird-lightning.

But the most curious passage, that which definitely condemns the substitution of the unfigurative for the figurative word while at the same time it confirms the idea of an allusion in the figurative word to a celestial phenomenon considered as the type of the object denoted by the figure, is the verse VI, 75, 11 which Grassmann and Ludwig⁵ translate almost alike as, "It (the arrow) puts on the garment of an eagle; its tooth is a savage beast; placed on the string, it flies when it is hurled". The first trait only is weakened: the exact translation should be, "It attires itself with the bird". The reference here, it is quite agreed, is to the feathers that trim the arrows. The formula recalls that of 'attired with cows' that has been studied above and confirms the interpretation which we have given to it. The word गो 'cow', it is certain, signifies 'milk' no more than the word सुपर्ण 'bird' [41]

¹ See *Religion Vedique*, I, p. 278 and note.

² अनुस्फुरम्. The use of the root *sphur* with the prefix *anu* in the verse VI, 67, 11 can lead to the belief that the 'cows' which are spoken of here are also the prayers assimilated at the same time with bow-strings.

³ Pp. 3-4.

⁴ Grassmann and Ludwig connect the participle गुमीताः with horses, and take the 'cow' for a 'bridle'. But the comparison with the verse X, 27, 22 which I have cited in the text appears to me to be decidedly in favour of my interpretation.

⁵ Ludwig translates, 'Mit Riemen zusammengebunden'. I do not know what image he has in mind,

does 'feather'. But let us pass on. I understand the second trait in the sense that the point of the arrow is made of the horn of some antelope, मृग .¹

The rest is not of much importance; what is certain is that the two parts of the arrow, the feathers and the point, are denoted, one by the name 'bird', and the other by the name of some animal. Now I ask, when to these two formulae there succeeds a third containing likewise the name of an animal, the cow, is it really translating the text when one simply substitutes the idea of string² for that of the cow? The third combination of the words 'bound to the cows' is no more strange than the first 'it attires itself with the bird', or the second, 'its tooth is an animal'.

The use of the words 'bird', 'animal (antelope)', 'cow' does not however constitute simple metonymy; there are metaphors also, metaphors whose meaning is explained by verse 15 of the same hymn, where the arrow is invoked by the epithet देवी 'divine,' and पर्जन्यरेतस् 'produced by the semen of Parjanya'. The allusion to the lightning is evident, and it is this allusion that explains the metaphors of verse 11. The lightning in fact is a bird.³ It could also in the eyes of the ṛsis take on the form of an antelope, as the mounts of the Maruts. Finally and chiefly it is 'bound to the cows', that is to say, is enveloped by the waters of the sky. This is exactly the same expression which we have seen applied to the war-chariot which likewise represents the lightning. Beside the warrior himself, the warrior attired in armour, it is in the first verse of the same hymn VI, 75, compared to a cloud.

As for the epithet गोअपरा VI, 53, 9 which Grassmann translates 'provided with straps' and Ludwig as 'having a cow's tail',

¹ Cf. verse 15 of the same hymn. Grassmann translates 'Lowe'!

² Or of the strap. See p. 40, note 5.

³ Here therefore the expression 'attires himself' would be equivalent to 'takes the form of', at least in so far as in the myth of the descent of Soma the bird cannot be distinguished from the arrow in its character of the 'carrier' of Soma-lightning.

it does not contain merely an allusion to the celestial cows. For, the 'goad' which receives this qualification is in the hands of a god, of Pūṣan. The word ओपश has probably, as believed by Roth and Grassmann himself, the meaning 'hair' or 'tuft of hair'. Whatever it may be, when Indra is seen carrying the sky like an ओपश, I, 173, 6, cf. VIII, 14, 5, and Soma taking the cloud for ओपश, IX, 71 1, it is not difficult to understand what is represented by the 'cows' that serve likewise as ओपश to the goad of Pūṣan.

I have said at the beginning that these observations on the figures of speech in the Rgveda ought not, in my opinion, [42] to be without interest for the lexicography. It has in fact been seen that in many cases they allow us to explain the text of the hymns without doing to the meaning all the kinds of violence which they have been subjected to at the hands of the interpreters who have been too much preoccupied with the exigencies of our modern taste. But this work has, if I am not mistaken, another object also. I have been reproached¹ for having 'taken for ready money the bold metaphors of the ancient ṛsis' and for assigning to these metaphors a mythological value. I have more than one reply to this criticism. And the best would be to finish the work at which the criticism was directed, that is to say, the complete reconstitution of a system where the formulae that are the subjects of the controversy are grouped up too well to allow of their being reduced in value to mere poetical figures, born of individual fancies. But at present I shall content myself with the argument which has been furnished to me by the observations that have gone above, and particularly the last ones on the uses of the word गो 'cow'. It has been seen in fact that what explains the most bizarre of these uses is precisely the allusion which they contain to certain religious conceptions and above all to the correspondence of the rites of the cult to celestial phenomena or even to the correspondence of the engines of war on the earth and in the sky. To unite Soma with the liturgical cows is to reproduce here below the union which he himself contracts with the

¹ Pischel, *Göttingische Anzeigen*, 1879, p. 168.

celestial cows. To hurl against the enemy the arrow or the war-chariot 'bound to cows', is to imitate Indra hurling against the demon the lightning which is enveloped in the celestial cows. And, this is very important, the rite which reproduces the phenomenon, the formula which assimilates the terrestrial weapon to the celestial one are like talismans which assure success to every one who employs them. Now, in the domain of the supernatural, the expressions that are most strange are found to be, because of the strangeness itself; the most appropriate for the ideas which they express or suggest. This is in my view the true explanation of the taste of the *ṛgis* for incongruous figures. The enigmas and the paradoxes that are the results of the incoherence of the metaphors are, for the rest, but one form of the Vedic enigma and paradox which have many forms and which occasionally assume that of the popular riddle containing, totally concealed, a mystical meaning. There is here the subject for a new work which I intend to publish shortly and which will be closely related to this.

A NOTE ON KṢA AND JÑA

BY

Prof. H. R. KAPADIA, M. A.

It appears that even in remote times keen desire was felt by mankind to give an outward manifestation to emotions and inward conceptions. For this purpose different methods seem to have been adopted by different persons at different times. One of them was to resort to writing. I do not intend to discuss here the evolution of the primitive scripts or the origin of alphabet regarding which several theories¹ have been propounded by previous scholars. I shall therefore confine myself to say a few words about some of the features pertaining to *kṣa* and *jña* written in *Devanāgarī* characters.

Broadly speaking we have two types of *Devanāgarī* characters : (1) *Jaina* and (2) non-*Jaina*.² In both these cases we find that out of the various conjunct consonants *kṣ* and *jñ* have each of them a special form³ wherein one cannot easily notice any trace⁴ of

¹ Out of these may be mentioned Mr. C. J. Gadd's theory, the opposite view expressed by Sir Flinders Petrie and Dr. Prāṇanātha's article viz. "How the alphabet began" published in the "Illustrated Weekly of the Times of India" vol. LVI, No. 36 and the following dated 8-9-35 etc.

Mr. Gadd has said in his "Sumerian Reading Book" that the evolution of primitive scripts points out two stages : (i) pictorial and (ii) the one which subsequently developed from it into hieroglyphic signs.

Sir Flinders says that signs rather than pictures are the primitive systems ; for, simplicity leads to complexity.

² See Appendix I (pp. 1-3) of "Descriptive Catalogue of Jaina Manuscripts" vol. XVII, pt. II.

2 Cf.	Jaina Devanāgarī	क्ष	ज्ञ
	Non-Jaina Devanāgarī	क्ष	ज्ञ

⁴ When the form resulting from the combination of two conjunct consonants leaves no trace of its constituents, it at times presents a very great difficulty in deciphering it. Some of the forms of conjunct consonants occurring in *Kharoṣṭhī* *lipi* bear testimony to this. Vide p. 33 of "The Palaeography of India" alias "Bhāratīya Prācīna Lipimālā"; a work in Hindi by Pandit Gaurishankar Hirachand Ojha.

the consonants of which they are composed.¹ क् and ख् put together in various² ways does not give rise to a form identified as क़.³ In the case of the *Jaina Devanāgarī* characters, both the parts are fairly noticeable in क़. The upper portion of this क़ shows that there is the form of *ka* occurring in the *Jaina* forms for *kr* and *ku*⁴, and that the lower portion of क़ shows ख् without its slant stroke.⁵

As regards *jña*, the presence of *j* (ञ्) can be seen in ज्ञ and ज्ञा, both the types⁶ of *Devanāgarī* characters⁷; but there remains a

¹ Since there is thus very little chance left of suspecting that *kṣa* and *jña* are ligatures, they are mentioned under the head "*mūlākṣaras*" in a "*Deśi Hisāb*". Furthermore we learn from "*The Palæography of India*" (p. 47) that *kṣa* and *jña* are each assigned a place in *Nāgarī varṇamālā*, as the original forms of their constituents are not maintained in the ligatures. Even *tra* is included in this *varṇamālā*, though the sign for र्, one of its constituents is visible in *tra*.

² Taking the *Devanāgarī* characters into account, क् placed to the left of ख् and ख् placed below क् are the ways expected in a normal course. Both these processes have been utilized in some of the southern characters. For instance, in Malayālam, Tāmil and Grantha characters we find the first method is adopted, whereas in Canarese and Telugu characters, the second method is adopted. Owing to want of suitable types I can illustrate as under the case pertaining to the Canarese characters only :—

Canarese	क	ख	क़
Non-Jaina Devanāgarī	क	ख	क्ष

³ In the form for *kṣa* in the Brāhmī script both the constituents *k* and *ṣa* seem to be present, and the ligature appears to have been formed by placing the latter below the former. See plate LXXXII given in "*Palæography of India*". In the script used in plate XVIII, the constituents for *kṣa* and *jña* are both distinct.

⁴ See Appendix II (p. 4) of D. C. J. M. vol. XVII, pp. II.

⁵ The latter remark is applicable to क्ष, too.

⁶ It appears that the former type is derived from the latter, the similar remark holding good for *kṣa*, too.

⁷ This remark is applicable to the Brāhmī character, too.

difficulty of tracing ॠ, though it may be guessed that the portion remaining after *j* is taken off from *jña*, resembles some part of it.

This will show that in the *Devanāgarī* form for *jña*, *ña* is assigned a place below *j*. Thus this method agrees with the way of writing *jña* in Canarese¹ and Telugu characters, whereas it differs from the way in which *jña* is written in Malayālam, Tāmil and Grantha characters; for, in these three characters *jña* is written by the side of *j* and to its left.

In this connection I may draw the attention of the learned reader to the plate² facing this page and especially to the third line from the bottom of a portion of the leaf 145^a which may be represented in non-Jaina characters without पृष्ठमात्रा³ as under:—

“ क्ज्ञानरूपं । मतिज्ञानादिकेष्वलज्ञानं । तं तस्य लाभ- ”

There are some persons who believe in *Mātṛka* theory. They opine that every letter and every symbol have something to do with a god or a goddess⁴, and that they quote a typical line viz. “*akṣaram paramam brahma*”. Will any one of them point out as to what god or goddess is associated with *kṣa* and *jña* as well?

Leaving aside for a moment the tradition that every letter is a *mantrākṣara*⁵, I would like to know if *kṣa* or *jña* has been

¹ Cf.

Canarese	ಜ	ಜ್	ಜ್ಞ
Non-Jaina Devanāgarī	ज	ज्र	ज्ञ

² A portion of this plate given below to the left and containing the date Sāmvat 1179, is in continuation with the bigger portion containing the circular diagram. This when placed to the right of this bigger portion with a marginal space between them forms leaf 145^b of this Ms. of which this is a facsimile. A portion marked as leaf 145^a forms a part of the same leaf of which it is the reverse. For further description of this Ms. see “D. C. J. M.” Vol. XVIII.

³ This is commonly known as *paṭimātrā* and it is connected by some with *pratimātrā* (Skr.).

⁴ Dr. Prāṇanātha has observed in his article referred to on p. 289 that the Tantrabhidhāna, Bijanighaṇṭu, Mudranighaṇṭu and Ekārthakośa throw light on this question.

⁵ Cf—

“ अमन्त्रमक्षरं नास्ति नास्ति मूलमनभिधम् ।

अथना पृथिवी नास्ति संयोगाः खलु दुर्लभाः ॥ ”

This is quoted by Śubhatilaka. See my edition of *Anekārtharatnamajñāṣa* (p. 82)

given in any work on *mantras*, as much importance as *praṇava*¹, a *māntrika* symbol. If there is no such evidence coming forth, will one be justified in saying that the *Jaina* and non-*Jaina* ways of writing *kṣa* and *jña* have nothing to do with the mysticism associated with *mantrākṣaras*?

I do not remember to have read anywhere the exact period² whence *kṣa* and *jña* have been each given a special form as we now find in both the types of *Devanāgarī* characters. Under these circumstances, I am tempted to deal with this question here.

That in *Devanāgarī* characters *k* and *ṣ* together make up *kṣ* is a well-known fact; but it remains to be ascertained whence this rule came into existence. So far as I know, it is not mentioned in *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, *Mahābhāṣya*, *Vārtika* and *Siddhāntakaumudī*. All the same this rule is found in *Candraprabhā* (p. 48) as under :--

“ कषयोर्योगे क्षः । ”

An earlier reference to this is met with in *Rūpamālā* (p. 49), a commentary on *Kātantra* as below :—

“ कषयोगे क्षः ॥ २५६ ॥ ”

As regards the form for *jña*, *Siddhāntakaumudī* (p. 82) on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (VIII-2-8) states that “ जञोर्ज्ञः । राज्ञः । राज्ञा । ”. In a foot-note (the third) on it we have :—

“ जञोर्ज्ञ इति-नेदमपूर्वादेशविधायकं सूत्रभाष्यवार्तिकेष्वापठितत्वात्, किंतु अभि-युक्तवचनम् । ”

From this it follows that out of Pāṇini, Patañjali and Kātyāyana none has stated that in *Devanāgarī* or any other script

1 This is written in two ways : (i) ॐ and (ii) ॐ. The first of them belongs to the *Jaina* script and the other to the non-*Jaina* one. The former way of writing *om* is what one can naturally expect; for, it is derived by writing ॐ (i. e. o in the *Jaina* script) with an anusvāra (nasal) on it. The latter way seems to be rather peculiar, for, in ॐ, a layman cannot trace ओ. A palaeographer like Pandit Ojha has suggested that ॐ is a modification of older o occurring in plates Nos. XVIII, XIX, XXI and XXXV. Moreover, he says (on p. 136) that it follows from the 25th plate.

From Dr. R. Shamsastri's learned article published in “ Indian Antiquary ” Vol. XXXV, pp. 253-267, 270-290 and 311-324 we learn that from the latter half of the 11th century A. D. the older form of *au* became current for *o*.

2 Incidentally I would like to know exactly from what period and for what reason, special forms for *and*, *et cetera*, *dollar* and *pound* (20 shillings) are being represented as &, &c, \$ and £.

the forms for *j* and *ña* when combined give rise to a special form *jña*.

In the *Cundraprabhā* above referred to, we have on p. 57 :—
“जओई:”

At first thought it struck me that the special forms for *kṣa* and *jña* might have originated in a land where people had to write *kṣa* and *jña*¹ many a time and who, whereupon wanted to save time and trouble. But I am not prepared to take a serious note of it, unless and until I can substantiate it by some other valid evidences and convincing arguments. It is, however, true that we come across passages and verses where *kṣa* occur several times. For instance, in *Jambū kavi's Jinaśataka*² one can trace many instances of this kind. As a typical example, may be quoted the following verse from this *Jaina* hymn :—

“क्षोणि क्षान्या क्षिपन्तः क्षणिकरतिकरलीकटाक्षक्षताक्षा
मोक्षक्षेत्राभिकाङ्क्षाः क्षपितशुभशानक्षिपविक्षेपदक्षाः ।
अक्षोभाः क्षीणरक्षाक्षरपटुवचना भिक्षवो महद्वलक्ष्मीं
साक्षाद् वीक्ष्य क्षिपन्ति क्षययतु स जिनः क्षय्यपक्षं यदद्वि ॥ ९ ॥”

The first hemistich of the following verse occurring in the tippana of *Sayaga* and in the tippanaka of *Pavayaṇasūruddhāra*, each composed by Udayaprabha Sūri may be also noted :—

“सपादलक्षक्षोणीशसमक्षं जितवादिनाम् ।
श्रीधर्मघोषसूरीणां पट्टालङ्कारकारकाः ॥ १ ॥”

As a fairly parallel example from a non-Jaina source, I may mention the first hemistich of the following verse given on p. 72 of Vidyānanda's *Pratāparudrayaśobhūṣana* :—

“क्षोणीरक्षणदक्षिणाः क्षतजगत्क्षोभा दुरीक्ष्यक्रमाः
क्षुद्रक्षत्रियपक्षशिक्षणविधौ प्रोक्षितकौक्षेयकाः ।
उद्दामोद्यमनस्य क्रूररूपतेर्दोर्दण्डयोश्चण्डयोः
गर्जद्गुर्जनगर्वपर्वतभिदा दम्भोलयः केलयः ॥”

—(प्रतापरुद्रिय—काव्यप्रकरण)

The 3rd *carana* of the verse beginning with नम्रत्वेनोत्तमन्तः and occurring in *Niśataka* also furnishes us with an example of *anuprās* of *kṣa* to some extent.

¹ *Jña* and *kṣa* occur a number of times in plate X given in “The Palaeography of India”.

² This is published in *Kāvya-mālā* as No. 7 by the Nirṇayasāgara Press in A. D. 1907.

The second *carāṇa* of the following verse from *Gaṅgūlaharī* can be also referred to in this connection :—

“ उदञ्चन्मात्सर्यस्फुटकपटहेरम्बजननी-
कटाक्षव्याक्षेपक्षणजनितसंक्षोभनिवहाः
भवन्तु त्वङ्गन्तो हरशिरसि गङ्गातनुधुव-
स्तरङ्गाः प्रोतुङ्गा दुरितभवभङ्गाय भवताम् ॥ ३ ॥ ”

Bāṇa's *Harṣacarit*, too, has several passages where three or four *kṣas* can be noticed ¹.

As in the case of *kṣa*, it is desirable that I should cite passages and verses which may furnish us with examples of *anuprāsa* of *jña*. But I am sorry to note that I do not remember to have come across any which can be assigned a place equal to verses quoted for *kṣa*. Will any scholar therefore kindly supply me with the pertinent instances? In the meanwhile, I may *en passant* refer to the following verse occurring in *Nīlśataka* :—

“ अज्ञः सुखमाराध्यते सुसुत्तरमाराध्यते विशेषज्ञः ।
ज्ञानलवदुर्विदग्धं ब्रह्माऽपि नरं न रञ्जयति ॥ ”

I may note as an additional example, the last *carāṇa* of the following verse from the *Naiṣadhiya carita* (canto III, v. 64) :—

“ ईशानिमैश्वर्यविवर्तमध्ये
लोकेशलोके शयलोकमध्ये ।
तियश्चमप्यश्च मृषानभिज्ञ-
रसज्ञतोपज्ञसमज्ञमज्ञम् ॥ ६४ ॥ ”

The ligatures *kṣa* and *jña* are not to be met with in every *lipi*. For instance, in the 46 letters which make up the *Brāhmī lipi* ² according to the 46th *saṃavāya* of *Samavāya*, the 4th *aṅga* of the *Jaina* canonical treatises, there is no mention of *jña*. Even the occurrence of *kṣa* is not a matter of certainty. For, Abhayadeva Sūri, while commenting upon *Samavāya* (XLVI) says that *kṣa* may have been included in the 46 letters of the *Brāhmī* script. ³

¹ See pp. 16, 61, 130 and 170 of the Bombay Sanskrit Series No. LXVI.

² Some of the details about this *lipi* are dealt with by me in a separate article “ Some Palaeographical data from the Jaina sources ” to be published in the Annals of B. O. R. Institute hereafter.

³ “ The Palaeography of India ” (p. 47) throws light in this connection ; for, there it is said that after a special form took place for the combination of *k* and *ṣ*, the Bauddhas included *kṣ* in the list of the *varṇas-mātrkas-siddha-mātrkās*. In the *tāntrika* works, *kṣa* and *jña* are each styled as a *varṇa* i. e. a *mātrka*.

Prof. Johann Georg Bühler denies its existence as can be seen from the following observation made by him in his "Indian Palæography" (p. 2) :—

" While the mātṛkāś *R*, *R̄*, *L*, *L̄* and the ligature *kṣa*, which in later times was often erroneously considered a *mātṛka* were excluded. "

Pandit G. H. Ojha, in " The Palæography of India " (p. 46) introduces *kṣa* in an optional manner for *ṣ*.

Now a word about the presence or absence of *kṣa* and *jña* in languages. The Sanskrit¹ language and the Vernaculars wherein *tatsama* words are used, contain words having *kṣ*² and *jñ*. But such is not case with the Prākṛit languages. These ligatures are absent there. Even the *ñ*, a constituent of *jña* has no room for it there, as can be seen from the following verse which is quoted by Malayagiri Sūri in his commentary (p. 3) to *Bṛhatkalpsūtra* :—

" ए-ओकारपराइं अंकारपरं च पायए नत्थि ।

व-सुगारमज्झिमाणि य क-चवग्ग-तवग्गनिहणाइं ॥ "

As *kṣ* and *jñ* are absent in Prakrit, I may say a few words regarding their substitutes.

The conjunct consonant *kṣ* is reduced to *kkh* and *cch*. The grammarians of the eastern school assert that *kkh* is a feature of Sauraseni, and *cch*, that of Māhārāṣṭri. Such a distinction is not as yet noticed to exist in the western school. In Aśva-ghoṣa and Bhāsa we have a number of cases where *kṣ* is replaced by *kkh*. *Kṣ* occurring in some of the Sanskrit words is even now reduced to *kkh* in Gujarātī and Marāṭhī as well.

The treatment in the case of *jñ* differs at different hands.³ On the one hand Hemacandra Sūri, the well-known poly-grapher reduces *jñ*, *ny* and *ṇy* to *jñ*, as is the case in

1 This is mentioned after Sanskrit in *Thāṇa* (II) of the third *aṅga*.

2 Even in Vaidika Sanskrit we have words containing *kṣ*. Vide *R̥g-Veda* (II. I. 10 ; etc.).

3 This topic is treated by my friend Prof. A. M. Ghatage, M. A., in his splendid article " Sauraseni Prakrit " (Journal of the University of Bombay, Vol. III, Pt. IV, pp. 55 and 56).

the Māhārāṣṭrī. It seems that most of the modern scholars follow in his foot-steps (Schmidt 6-7). Vararuci mentions an option of substituting *ñj* instead of *jñ* in the case of words like *viñā* (12, 7), but only *nn* in the case of *inñitañā* and *sarvñā* (12, 8). Kramadīśvara substitutes *ñj* for *jñ* occurring in *adhijñā*, *pratijñā*, *yajñā* and *viñā* (5, 76). Dr. Pischel opines that both these rules are rather doubtful; for, no other grammarian has mentioned them, and that this is probably due to an error on the part of scribes who copied Mss.

Mārkaṇḍeya gives both *jj* and *nn* for *jñ* (9, 46). Aśvaghoṣa replaces *jñ* by *ññ*, whereas Bhāsa substitutes both *ññ* and *nn* almost with equal frequency.

I may conclude this note by referring to the pronunciation of *jñā*. I have heard it being pronounced in various ways¹ such as *dñā*, *dñā*, *gñā*, *gñā*, *gyā* etc, even when it is admitted by the speakers that *j* and *ñā* combined together make up *jñā*. Thus it appears that its pronunciation has something to do with provincialism.

In "The Palæography of India" (p. 47) it is said that the Deccanics pronounce *jñā* as *dñā*² some persons in the north of India as *gyā* and a few Sanskritists, something like *gñā*.

¹ This is likely to remind one about the differences in the pronunciation of the liquid letters viz. *r* and *l*. In this connection it has been remarked in "The Palæography of India" (p. 44) that many a person pronounce *र* and *ल* as *रि* and *लि*; some of the people of the Deccan as *रु* and *लु* and some of the Northern India as the Vaidika *र* and *ल*. But none of these ways is correct.

² Vide the English title of ज्ञानप्रकाश. Is this due to the mode of writing *jñā* in Modī as *d* plus *na*?

MISCELLANEA

BHĀNUDATTA AND BHĀNUKARA

BY

DR. S. K. DE, M. A., D. Litt.

In his very interesting article on the poet Bhānukara Dr. Haradatta Sarma has referred to the question of the date of Bhānudatta, with whom he proposes to identify Bhānukara. He has criticised the date 1428 A. D. given by me (*Sanskrit Poetics* I, p. 248) as the *terminus ad quem* of Bhānudatta's date ; but he appears to have overlooked my note (at p. 252 of the same work) where I had indicated that this date was not beyond doubt. His attention may be drawn in this connexion to my subsequent article on Bhānudatta's date (which also he seems to have overlooked) placed before the Fourth All-Indian Oriental Conference and published in its *Summaries of Papers* (Allahabad 1926, pp. 40-43). In this article I have definitely rejected the date 1428 A. D. for 1572 A. D. , which Dr. Sarma, agreeing with Mr. Gode, now proposes; and I have, on independent grounds, attempted a closer approximation of Bhānudatta's date to the end of the 15th and beginning of the 16th century. This dating will dispose of Dr. Sarma's surprise that Bhānudatta is not at all quoted in the *Śaṅgadhara-paddhati*, which was compiled much earlier at about 1363 A. D.

The fact of Bhānudatta's having more Southern commentators than Northern does not finally settle the question as to whether Bhānudatta belonged to Videha or Vidarbha. It is possible, as Dr. Sarma suggests, that he wandered from place to place ; but this does not prove the question either way.

There are two minor points in Dr. Sarma's statements which require modification. It is hardly correct to state that Jayadeva, the author of the *Gita-govinda*, was a Maithila poet ; he belonged to Bengal. In his footnote 1, p. 254, Dr. Sarma appears to think that I have identified Sureśvara, the ancestor of Bhānudatta, with the Sureśvara, who was a contemporary of the great Śaṅkara. But I have not done so. Probably Dr. Sarma was misled by the description that Bhānudatta's ancestor Sureśvara was the author of

Śārīrakabhāṣya-vārttika ; but this description is given in Bhānudatta's *Kumāra-bhārgaviya* itself. On the other hand referring to this question, I have already remarked in my article referred to above (p. 43) : " In the genealogy of the *Kumāra-bhārgaviya* mention is made of one Sureśvara, son of Ratneśvara, who was an ancestor of Bhānudatta, separated by six generations from himself, and who wrote a *Śārīrakabhāṣya-vārttika*. We need not identify, with Eggeling, this Sureśvara with the famous Sureśvara who was a disciple of Śaṅkarācārya ; for otherwise the date of our Bhānudatta would have to be unwarrantably pushed back to a time which would be inconsistent with other date furnished by his text. "

The main argument on which Dr. Sarma relies for the identity of the poet Bhānukara and Bhānudatta is that a large number of Bhānudatta's verses are assigned to Bhānukara in some very late anthologies. It is true that Bhānudatta himself was not a very early writer, and we cannot expect to find his verses quoted in early anthologies ; but one should take very cautiously the evidence supplied by anthological compilations. By far the largest number of Bhānudatta's verses in question are found assigned to Bhānukara in compilation, entitled *Padya-rācanā* by Lakṣmaṇa Bhaṭṭa Ankolakara ; but for this work its editors themselves (ed. Kāvya-mālā 86) would not venture to claim a higher antiquity than even a hundred years. Of the other anthologies mentioned, the *Rasika-jīvana* belongs to the 17th century, and the *Subhāṣita-hārāvali*, as Mr. P. K. Gode has shown, to the end of the 17th century. The attributions in anthologies are notoriously careless and confused, and one would require a more substantial and independent evidence of identity than such attributions occurring in comparatively modern compilations of doubtful value. I may, however, add that since both Bhānudatta and Bhānukara refer to one Nijāma-dharaṇīpāla or Nijāmā Shāha, whom I have proposed to identify with Ahmad Nizām Shah who obtained possession of Daulatābād some time between 1499 and 1507 A. D. and founded the Nizam Shah dynasty of Dekkan, it is quite possible that they might have been contemporaries, but this alone does not identify the two writers.

REVIEWS

DHARMA AND SOCIETY by Dr. G. H. Mees, M. A., LL. D.,
published by N. V. Servire -- the Hague and Luzac & Co.,
London, W. C. I., pp. XV + 206; Price, cloth 12/6 s. and
paper 9/6 s.

This is a very instructive and thought-provoking work. The subject is treated with great sympathy for the aspirations of India throughout the ages and understanding of the problems that confronted the Indians of all times. The aim of the work, as stated in the preface (XII), is 'to inquire into the nature of Dharma--the fundamental motive force in the life of man as a social being--in connection with a comparative study of the theory and ideal of *varna* (natural class) and the phenomena of caste in India and incidentally of class in the west '. The purpose of the work is not to test the Hindu theories philosophically or morally; but to show that the fundamental nature of dharma (and of related conceptions) is a mystic one (p. XIII). It is impossible to convey, in a brief review such as the present, even a vague idea of the contents of this work. The work is divided into two parts. The first part deals with dharma as conceived by the ancient Hindus, the various meanings that were attributed to dharma, the various distinctions of dharma according to subject (viz. svadharma, varṇadharma, jātidharma, deśadharama, gaṇadharma &c.), the four ends of life (*puruṣārtha*) and their relation to varṇas and āśramas, characteristics of dharma (*dhamma*) as conceived by the Buddhists, conceptions akin to *dharma* among other ancient peoples, distinction between varṇa and caste, the five conceptions about varṇa (racial, cultural, professional, symbolical and occult); the meaning and conception of Ārya characteristics, origin and function of jātis (castes); the āśramas. Out of the two parts, the second is the more important. The author tries to establish that varṇa theory in its wider sense was a theory not applying to Hindu society exclusively, but to human society generally, in other words ' varṇa ' contains a universal element and is a theory of natural class, and that there

was a tendency to uphold it as an international ideal (p. 79) in consequence of which even foreigners were in ancient times adopted into the social system of India. The author points out how in the ancient Iranian and other cultures there were four classes corresponding to the four varṇas of ancient India. The learned author distinguishes between two aspects of dharma, the one corresponding more or less to varṇa and the other to caste, he endeavours to demonstrate at great length that in alternate periods (called by him 'periods of life' and 'periods of form') the corresponding aspect of dharma predominated, that in different periods of form various 'social evils' were evolved and that as a reaction to the tendency towards social crystallization and caste separatism we find again and again in Indian history the promulgation of dharma in its first aspect by great teachers who heralded 'periods of life' (p. 87). As examples of the latter he refers to the Upaniṣads (which marked a 'period of life' against the formalism of the ritual end dogmas of the Brāhmaṇa Literature), the preaching of *dharma* by Buddha whose influence was directly social by propagating the spiritual equality of man, by opening up the spiritual path to all, irrespective of caste or sex (p. 95). The author however points out (p. 96) that there was a biologically unsocial element in Buddha's teaching withdrawing the noblest elements of humanity from the married state to monkhood and that the army of idle monks and nuns was one of the causes of the disappearance of Buddhism from India. Then Śaṅkarācārya inaugurated a new period of life by establishing the one Godhead and truth as against the doctrines of the many sects that existed and by making the Vedānta philosophy the basis of all the nobler movements of Hinduism. Then came the Vaiṣṇava Reformation of which Rāmānuja may be called a fore-runner (p. 98). The author refers to the work of the Ārya-Samāj, of Vivekananda, of poet Tagore and Mahātmā Gandhi as heralding the birth of a new 'period of life'. In contrast to the foregoing periods of life, the author instances as periods of form the complicated Vedic ritual (in the Brāhmaṇas), the systematized and dogmatized dharma contained in the dharmasāstras such as those of Manu (chapter III about food proper for śrāddha, chap. IV about rules for householders). As social evils of the

periods of form he instances the practice of Sati (p. 104), the prohibition of the remarriage of widows (p. 105), the gradual lowering of the status of women from Vedic times downwards (pp. 111-112), child marriage (pp. 110), untouchability (pp. 111-112.)

The author summarises his estimate of the Brāhmanas in these words (p. 113) ' Hinduism owes to true Brahmins the blessings of the theory and ideal of Varṇa, and to the Brahmins as caste-upholders many of the diseases of caste. ' He does not subscribe to the view of some that the complicated caste system was an invention of the Brāhmanas, but he appears to think that if the Brāhmanas had lived up to the Varṇa standard, had worked for the realization of Varṇa in the social mind and had maintained a healthy self-criticism; caste would never have come into existence (p. 116).

The author tries to show that not only in India but everywhere in the world cyclic processes of sleep and renaissance have gone on from remote times (pp. 121-126) and that man's task has been from the beginning to learn to use his hands as his soul inspiring practical brotherhood, directs i. e. that part of the population which corresponds to the three lower varṇas must be guided by the highest varṇa.

In contrasting the theory of varṇa with caste the author remarks ' In the theory of varṇa we find the social duty of the individual always on the foreground and never his personal rights and in accordance with this it contains the principle that the higher the varṇa, the more exacting the duties and the stricter education. This principle was lost sight of to some extent in caste when the tendency appeared to lay more stress on privilege than on duty ' (p. 127).

The author says ' there were originally only two varṇas, a fair and a dark one. But soon the conception of three higher varṇas must have developed from the classes into which the fair coloured people became divided. But when classes began to develop into castes and sub-castes varṇa became theory and ideal. Yet for a long time it remained possible for people of

lower classes to pass into higher classes (pp. 136-137).' The author relies for this last proposition on the stories of Janaka, Satyakāma Jābāla, Kavaśa Ailūśa and others.

The author wisely remarks ' in the West the social mind is obsessed by the idea of economical power, in India by the idea of caste power. A reviving sense of varṇa may free the social mind of its obsession, then the natural hierarchy must again emerge out of the social unconscious into the light of recognition and in proportion to this the tyranny of power will be weakened' (p. 145).

The author's thesis is that in the natural hierarchy there cannot be one moral standard for all, that the normal standard of one high up in the natural hierarchy will be the ideal for a person lower in the scale and will be entirely unintelligible to a person at the bottom, that it is illogical to require and expect the same conduct from these three people and to put before them the same ideal (p. 146). He thinks that the Christian church has tended to do this, with the positing of the ' Christian duty ', that the Church pointed to the goal, but did not show the steps and that it failed to show sense of reality and a sense of proportion (p. 147). He is of opinion that when the śāstras speak of the eight forms of marriage they have in mind this principle of natural hierarchy. The author finds fault with westerners for turning up their noses against Indians for their caste system when ' Europe has developed separative nation-castes which for the moment tend to grow away more and more from the organic basis' (p. 150). Internationalism is nothing but the sense of social unity plus the urge of the expression of unity (speaking mystically) or the sense of sociality plus the urge towards integration (speaking sociologically).

The author acutely points out that though the theory of varṇa implicates the social inequality of man (which is the vertical view of society), it does not contain any principle of spiritual inequality, which is the horizontal view of society (p. 153). This he supports by reference to the fact that the main schools of Hindu philosophy hold that Brahman is the origin of all things, of all beings and that Brahman is the goal and that into which all will eventually dissolve.

The author deals with the topic of varṇa-saṁkara (which has two aspects viz., mixture of castes and also mixture of Varṇa). For the latter he refers to Bhagavadgītā 18-45 and 47.

The author winds up by saying that ' no serious student of caste will propagate the abolishment of the caste system' (p. 192), but he also seems to hold (relying on a statement of Dr. Ghurye in his work ' Caste and Race in India ' that some efforts made during the last few years in that direction failed) that to propose to abolish caste by slow consolidation of the small groups is to miss the real problem. His own view seems to be that the theory and ideal of 'cāturvarṇya' will have to come forward again in the consciousness of the people not as the model on which to remould the caste system by legislation but as the fundamental theory of the composition of society, public opinion will do the rest and the problems of caste will solve themselves and new classes will emerge from the crumbling remains of the old castes. This is rather very vague and one wonders how long it will take before this prophecy materializes even partially and what efforts ordinary individuals and institutions are to make before the ferment of ideas throws up a personality like Buddha or Śaṅkarācārya.

From the fact that the author quotes well-known authors, Vedic texts and works like Āpastamba and the Mahābhārata from text-books on caste (e. g. pp. 107n, 118n, 1 and 2. 139n 2, where all the quotations are acknowledged to have been taken from N. K. Dutt's 'Origin and growth of caste in India) it is reasonable to infer that the author has not made any first hand study of the original Sanskrit texts. In spite of this the author displays great insight into the working of ancient Indian society. One can well express substantial agreement with most of the main conclusions which the learned author has drawn. The author relies too much on works of other writers on caste and does not explore for himself the vast material on Varṇa in the original texts. He quotes profusely from the Manusmṛti, the Mahābhārata, the Bhāgavata and other purāṇas, but Vedic material is conspicuous by its paucity. There are however several minor matters where one differs from the learned author. On pp. 33 and 88 he still clings to the theory of the late Dr. Bühler that the present code

of *Manu* is a recast of the ancient *Mānavadharmasūtra*. On p. 190 he puts the extant *Mahābhārata* several centuries earlier than *Aśoka*. On p. 92 he appears to state a sweeping generalisation that the *Upaniṣads* were composed by non-*Brāhmaṇas*. Although the printing and general get-up are excellent, there are several misprints not noticed even in the errata (vide pp. 27 l. 3, 151 l. 19, p. 106n. 5 *Vasiṣṭha* XV, 73-78 should be XVII. 73-78), several lapses in transliteration (p. 28 *śamā* for *śama*, p. 114n *Brahmā* for *Brahma*) and the inaccurate ascription (on p. 54n. 1) of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* to the Black *Yajurveda*.

P. V. Kane

THE PADYĀVALĪ. An anthology of Vaiṣṇava Verses in Sanskrit, compiled by Rūpa Gosvāmin, A Disciple of Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Caitanya of Bengal. Critically edited by Sushil Kumar De of the University of Dacca. Dacca University Oriental Publications Series, No. 3. Published by the University of Dacca, 1934. pp. i-cxlv, 1-296.

This bulky volume of about 450 pages is a welcome addition to the Anthological literature in Sanskrit. The text of the book is based on sixteen mss. and two printed editions. The task of collation is indeed laborious and Dr. De is to be congratulated on his brilliant performance. The lengthy introduction is an important contribution to the History of Vaiṣṇavism and the Bhakti movement in Bengal (a problem which Dr. De defers for another work which is forthcoming). The editor gives here a very lucid exposition of Bhakti as a Rasa, its comparison and contrast with the Rasa of the orthodox school of Sanskrit Poetics (p. lxxxix). He has also made a clear distinction between the old type of Bhakti as found in the Bhagavadgītā and other works, and the erotic mysticism in the language of earthly passion, a special characteristic of the Caitanya school. There is no doubt that this sort of mental attitude has in some cases led to a sort of degeneration from the high plane of religious mysticism to the low depths of earthly passion. And it may be argued that there is always a danger of this type of poetry leading to sensualism. But in order to appreciate it we must adopt the right type of mental attitude. In any case " however gross or crude their cry of natural passion may sometime appear to modern taste, it is impossible to underrate its reality and frankness, the sweet, tender and familiar force of its palpitating humanity. " (p. cv). In other words it is the cry of the individual soul desirous of communion with the Universal Soul.

It is interesting to note that the Subhāṣita-Hārāvalī of Śrī Hari Kavi (Peterson : Second Report of the Search of Sanskrit Mss ; pp. 57-64 and No. 92; Poona, xviii A, 92 of 1883-4) which was composed in the middle of the 17th century A. D. (See my Article: The Subhāṣita-Hārāvalī of Śrī Hari Kavi and some

Poets enjoying the Patronage of Muslim Rulers. Indian Historical Quarterly, X. 1934, pp. 478-485) has drawn upon this Padyā-vallī. For, herein the verses of Rūpa Gosvāmin himself are not ascribed to his name but to *samāhartuḥ* as in the Padyā. S. Hār. borrows as many as 36 verses from the Padyā. The importance of the S. Hār. lies in the fact that many of the readings found in it are not met with in any of the mss. used in the text of the Padyā. Again, some new verses from the authors quoted in the Padyā. are found here. It quotes 3 verses of Gopinātha Paṇḍita who as far as I can judge from the contents of the verses, must be identical with Gopinātha Ācārya of Navadvīpa at whose house Īśvarapurī composed his Śrī Kṛṣṇa-līlāmṛta (p. xiii). The verses are as follows.

मुरारेर्मरारेस्त्रिभुवननिदानस्य च मिथो
 न भेदोऽस्तीत्येवं सकलनिगमौघस्य भणितिः ।
 तथाप्याभिराणां ललितललनामण्डलगते
 मनःश्यामाकारे वसति परमब्रह्मणि मम ॥ fol. B 21a, 76.
 आराज्जनं जनानि कंचिदपि प्रयातुं
 मा देहि ते भवति दर्शनतः पिशाचः ।
 विन्यस्य मूर्ध्नि भवति खलु जह्नुकन्ये
 प्रेतप्रदेशमभियास्यति वीतवासाः ॥ fol. B 26, 45.
 केषांचिच्छितिकण्ठे वैकुण्ठे प्रीतिरन्येषाम् ।
 मम तु द्वावपि तुलयौ हस्तद्वयौ मोदकन्यायात् ॥ fol. B 27, 57.

Following is the list of verses common to Padyā. and S. Hār. with different readings according to the latter.

No. of verse in the Printed Text.	No. and the readings acc. to S. Hār.
29,	B 18a. a) tvamphasām; b) mukti-stri (śrī) yaḥ; lines c and d reversed. c) -śca-ryāmasāvikṣate.
8. Dākṣiṇātyasya.	B 18. Dākṣiṇāyanasya.
9.	B 19a.
10. Viṣṇupurīpādānām.	do. Anonymous.
39. Śrīmadbhagavad-Vyāsapā-dānām.	do. do. d) -harṣāśrupulakodga-māḥ.

No. of verse in the Printed Text.	No. and the readings acc. to S. Hār.
40.	B 19 ^a
43.	do. d) -dapavargam.
119. kasyacit.	do. Samāhartuḥ.
123.	B 19.
55.	do.
54.	do. a) -karmapañka-
56. Sarvajñasya.	B 20a. Sarvakasya.
53.	do.
58.	do.
75.	B 20a. 70. a) -daripratyagra-; b) -nandamayam; d) kṛḍati.
77.	B 20, 71.
78.	„ 72. d) -latābandhe.
81. Madhavasya.	„ 75. Anon. c) vivekanipunāḥ.
79.	B 21a. 78. b) devāḥ.
97. Raghupatiyupādhyāyasya.	B 21, 83. Raghūpādhyāyasya.
32.	B 22a, 92.
27.	„ 94. a) svargārthādya-
18.	„ 95. b) nirbharamamī; d) grāmaśyāmala-
60.	B 22, 96. a) sambhrtabhrami-; c) diptenādyā-
61.	„ 97. c) aśaraṇajana-
64.	B 22, 98. c) bhaktavatsala iti.
66.	„ 99.
68.	B 23, 8. d) he kārūṇyanilhe.
67.	„ 9. a) kaśābhīrātātābhīrātā indriyakānanāntara-
31. Śrī Bhagavataḥ.	„ 10. Anon. a) bahutātma- viśeṣaśakti-
34.	B 24a, 11.
33.	„ 12.
36. Śrī Vaiṣṇavasya.	„ 13. Anon.
37. „	„ 14. „ d) karnadhāra Bhagavan.
38. Śrī Gopālabhaṭṭānām.	„ 15. Anon.
125. Sarva-Vidyāvinodānām.	„ 17. „

Following are the new verses of Kaviratna, Vāṇīvilāsa and Hariharabhaṭṭa.

Kaviratna :—

कृतचन्दनाङ्गरागो मदनसखः श्रीफलद्वेषी
सुन्दरि सुवर्णवर्णो वक्षोजः कीदृशो रुद्रः ॥ fol. A 11, 126.
अस्मिन् प्रकृतिमनोज्ञे लग्ना प्रायेण मान्मथी दृष्टिः ।
सुन्दरि यतो भवत्याः प्रतिक्षणं क्षीयते मध्यः ॥ fol. A 14a, 55.

Vāṇivilāsa :—

न केलिः कीमारी न च हृदि मनोभूर्निविशते
स्थिरा वा लोला वा न च न पुनरीतिर्विजयते ।
न तादृक् नान्यादृक् परिणमति वक्षस्तदुभयं
शिशुत्वं तारुण्यं समगतमिह द्वारि मनसः ॥ fol. A 18, 1.

Hariharabhattacha :—

स्फूर्जंज्योत्स्नावलक्षाश्चमरसहचरीबालभारैः सदृक्षा-
श्चन्द्रश्रेणिसकक्षाः स्फटिकमणिशिलाभङ्गसपक्ष्यपक्षाः ।
श्रीखण्डोत्कर्षदक्षाः सितसरसिरुहां दत्तसौभाग्यभिक्षाः
शृङ्गारोपात्तशिक्षा मुरारिपुमिलने पान्तु लक्ष्मीकटाक्षाः ॥

fol. B 10, 80

By the middle of the 17th century, that is, about one hundred years after its composition, the Padyā. seems to have acquired wide fame and its Ms. or Mss. must have travelled far south. For Hari Kavi seems to have been a southerner as is evident from the following verse.

इहान्ये ते विप्राः प्रतिसदनमागत्य कृपणाः
कणान्याचन्ते ये परिगणितनक्षत्रातिथयः ।
वयं कार्णाटीनां कुचकलशपत्राङ्कुरलता-
विलासव्यासङ्गोल्लसितमनसः केऽपि कवयः ॥ fol. 31a, 93.

The verse "uddhūyeta tanūlateti", etc., ascribed to Ānanda in the Padyā. (358) is ascribed to Jayadeva in the Padyaracanā 40.6 (Kāvya-mālā No. 89). The verse "citrotkrapādapi", etc., anonymous in the Padyā. is signed as (kasyāpi) [Hariharasya] in the Padyaracanā, 67. 54.

Dr. De. has collected a great deal of historical material on the contemporaries of Caitanya and the other six Gosvāmins. In the elaborate Notes appended to the volume he has thrown new light on many of the poets quoted in the Padyā. The different Indices enhance the value of the edition and make the task of the workers in the same field much lighter.

Har Dutt Sharma

Eine indo-arische Metaphysik des Kampfes und der Tat. Die Bhagavadgītā in neuer Sicht von J. W. Hauer. Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 1934. Price RM 3. pp. I-VII, 1-76.

The new view point presented by Prof. Hauer in this book is that Gītā teaches Action or performance of one's duties, howsoever adverse the circumstances may be. And this peculiar attitude of fight has been the special characteristic of the life of those people who have Aryan blood flowing in their veins. Prof. Hauer's main purpose of writing this volume is to present this new interpretation to German people who are today engaged in shaping the destiny of their nation. He rightly remarks in the introduction that scholars (we should say specially in Europe) had till now been more concerned about the exterior of the book, its passages, the different interpretations, etc. On the contrary in India the metaphysical problem of the Gītā has been the main view point from which it is mostly studied. From many, one may quote the instance of Gītārahasya (The Secret of Gītā) of the late B. G. Tilak. And what is more astonishing is that Tilak's work anticipates much of what is found in this book under review.

The book is divided into six chapters and Prof. Hauer has grasped the essence of the Gītā with remarkable insight. He gently leads the reader from topic to topic till he shows him the final goal of human effort. Every thinking human being is faced with a conflict of duties at times in his life. Even against his will he has to perform several actions. And actions bind him by their result. This life is but a fight. It is a tragedy. It was realised by Arjuna as well as Kṛṣṇa. But the latter would not allow him to give up the fight, howsoever tragic the result might be. Kṛṣṇa teaches him that we cannot give up actions. We should not, nay we cannot acquire " akarmanyatā " (Nichttätigkeit). The best way is to act with a detached mind which will lead us to freedom from actions " Naiṣkarmya " (Freiheit von Werkverhaftung). This freedom from actions is attained by a person if he leaves the fruits of actions and considers himself as only a tool in the cosmic order (prakṛti) of God. We should develop the idea of sacrifice which is complete self-surrender in

action. In this way we can become free from the responsibility or consequence of our action. We become a part of the cosmic order (the prakṛti, which word, Prof. Hauer rightly remarks, should be translated as Urnatur and not Materie) of God. Our aim should be to realise this and establish union with Godhead.

Prof. Hauer has avoided all philological and critical discussions about the text and has presented his theme in simple language and very clearly. The notes which he has added are also not copious. Specially interesting is his comparison of the view of the Gītā with Kant (p. 45). He quotes Kant at length in his note II on pp. 72-4. This point has been discussed briefly in the Gītārahasya, pp. 216-7 (Hindi Trans. Poona, 1917). Prof. Hauer discusses in note 15, pp. 74-5 the translation of the first line of Gītā XVIII 47 and III, 35, viz ,

Śreyān svadharmaṃ viguṇaḥ paradharmaṃ svanuṣṭhitāt.

He points out that *svanuṣṭhitāt* should be translated as " gut zu erfüllen ", " leicht erfüllt ", i. e., good to perform or easily performed. He rejects " gut erfüllt " " recht ausgeübt ", i. e., well done or correctly performed. Similarly, according to him *viguṇa* means opposed bringing or creating some opposition, etc., and not incomplete, bad or unvirtuous. No doubt the meaning rejected by Prof. Hauer is that by Śaṅkarācārya, but the meaning adopted by Prof. Hauer is what has already been given by the late B. G. Tilak in his Gītārahasya..

There can be no two opinions about the goodness of the book and the brilliance and deep insight of writer. We can safely say that this is one of the most sympathetic studies ever written by a European Scholar.

Har Dutt Sharma

THE JASMINE GARLAND (KUNDAMĀLĀ) Translated into English by A. C. Woolner, C. I. E., M. A. (Oxon.), Hon. D. Litt. (Panjab), F. A. S. B., Officier D' Académie Française; Principal, Oriental College, Lahore; Vice-chancellor of the University of the Panjab, Punjab University Oriental Publications, No. 27. Oxford University Press, London. 1935. pp. V-XIV; 1-50. Price 6 shillings.

This translation of Kundamālā is a valuable addition to Indology, coming as it does from the pen of an eminent Indologist of Dr. Woolner's repute. There are some printing mistakes, the fewness of which is but a compliment to the renowned Oxford University Press and to the still more renowned scholar Dr. Woolner.

But the most serious mistake committed is on p. 12, foot-note 1, where we read:—"Kausalyā was the wife of Dhṛtarāṣṭra and the mother of Rāma."

The name Diñnāga has led to much controversy among the scholars. [See: The Date of the Kundamālā by A. C. Woolner (Annals of the B. O. R. I., Vol. XV, 1933-34, pp. 236-239). On Kundamālā by S. K. De (Annals of the B. O. R. I. Vol. XVI, 1934-1935, p. 158). Kundamālā and the Uttaraṛāmacarita by K. A. Subramania Iyer (Proceedings of the 7th Oriental Conference, Baroda, pp. 91-97)]. One of the reasons for giving the name Diñnāga to the author of Kundamālā is that the first editors of this work (in the Dakṣiṇābhārati—grantha-mālā, no 2, intro. p. iii) state that in a manuscript copy of Vallabha-deva's Subhāṣitāvalī, the second verse of the First Act of Kundamālā is ascribed to Diñnāga. Dr. Woolner very pertinently remarks in the Introduction of his translation 'but we are not told the date of this Ms., which differs from the printed edition' (p. vi, fn. 1). Now, the following statement of Veda Vyasa and Bhanot in the Introduction to their edition is very misleading:—"the second verse of our drama is quoted under Diñnāga in Vallabha-deva's Subhāṣitāvalī, etc.' (p. IV). This statement has led Mr. Subramania Iyer to the error of supposing that the second

editors refer to the printed edition of Subhāsitāvalī (see Proceedings of the Baroda Oriental Conference).

An uncritical statement of Messers Veda Vyasa and Bhanot is quoted by Dr. Woolner also in his introduction (p. v, fn. 2):—
 “A Dhīranāga, styled Bhavanta (*obviously a misprint for Bhadanta*) is mentioned in the Sūktimuktāvalī (Veda Vyāsa and Bhanot)! ” (The italics are mine). Dr. Woolner should have examined the veracity or otherwise of this statement by referring to the very detailed description of the Ms. of Jahlapa’s Sūktimuktāvalī given by the late Sir R. G. Bhandarkar in his Reports on the Search of Sanskrit. Mss., 1887–91 (now published in the Collected works of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, Vol. II, pp. 349–412). Sir Bhandarkar has not only given a historical account of the work but has preserved for us the *pratīkas* of the verses together with the names of the authors. Here we find no mention of Dīnnāga or Bhadanta Dhīranāga.

Now this much discussed verse *Jvālevordhavisarpiṇī*, etc., (Kundamālā, I. 2), is found quoted in the Saduktikarṇāmṛta (=Skm.) I. 12. 1, of Śrīdharadāsa (Saduktikarṇāmṛta of Śrīdharadāsa, edited by the late P. Rāmāvatāra Śarmā Pāṇdeya, with a critical Introduction by Dr. Har Dutt Shāma. Published by Motilal Banarsi Dass, Saidmittha Bazar, Lahore, 1930) This verse is attributed to Ravināga there. Now, if we take into consideration the evidence of Nāṭyadarpaṇa (Gaekwad Oriental Series, No. XLVIII), viz., *Viranāga-nibaddhāyām Kundamālāyām*, etc., (p. 48), then we can say that most probably Viranāga is the name of the author and that *Vira* has become *Ravi* in the Skm. through the vagaries of some scribe or scribes. Had Dr. Woolner consulted Skm. then he would have been able to find out a better reading and also an improved translation of the verse referred to above. In Kundamālā the last two lines of this verse read:

saṁdhyevārdramṛṇālakomalatanorindoh sadāsthāyini

Pāyād vastaruṇūruṇāṁśukapilā Śambhorjaṭāsaṁhatih.

In place of the underlined portions Skm. reads *sahassthāyini* and *jaṭāsaṁhatih*. Dr. Woolner translates these lines as ‘like twilight eternal or the crescent moon delicate as fresh lotus stem’. Dr. Woolner must have felt the difficulty of construing *sadāsthāyini*

which he joins with *saṁdhyā*. But it is difficult to understand as to how and with what does he construe the genitive case in *ārdramṛṇālakomalatanorindoh*. On the other hand, if we adopt the reading of Skm. the construction would be simple.

ārdramṛṇālakomalatanoh indoh sahassthāyini (accompanying the moon, etc.,) *saṁdhyā iva*. Similarly, *jaṭāsamhatih* of Skm. is certainly a better reading than *jaṭāsamtatih*.

The translation is mostly very free, although at one or two places it becomes too literal to be correct as (on p. 31, fn. 1) when the word *siṇiddha* = *snigdha* is translated as 'sticky'.

The following points in translation deserve special mention.

P. 3, line 20. It would be better to say 'assisting me *by* summoning' instead of 'assisting me *in* summoning', as the text is: *āryāsamāhvānena sahāyamiva me sampādayati*.

P. 4, line 6. It is difficult to agree with the translator when he translates the word *amandram* as 'softly'. It should be translated as 'loudly' *mandra* means *gabhīra*, deep.

P. 5, line 18. Dr. Woolner translates the word *paricchada* as 'blessing'. But the word means 'attendants', which, no doubt, may be included, but along with many other things, under 'blessings'.

P. 6, last line. After *Sitā*, the stage direction *lajjām nāṭayati* of the text ought to have been translated and not altogether left out.

P. 7, lines 16-17. Dr. Woolner following Jayacandra translates *nahi taha aṇṇāsattū paiṇo itthiājaṇassa dukkaṁ uppādedi jaha aṇṇāsatto* 'for a wife devoted to another does not pain her husband as a faithless husband pains a wife.' But, really speaking, a wife devoted to another person causing less pain to her husband is entirely against Indian genius. The passage can be construed in a better way and give appropriate meaning: *nahi taha paiṇo sattū aṇṇā itthiā jaṇassa dukkaṁ uppādedi jaha aṇṇāsatto*. Taking the word *paiṇo* (genitive) in the sense of locative, the meaning of the passage will be:—'a woman devoted to husband (i. e., a *sapatnī*) does not cause so much pain to a wife as the husband devoted to another woman.'

P. 7, line 29 and P. 10, line 32. Dr. woolner translates the term *varṇāśrama* as 'caste and hermitage' which is wrong. The word

āśrama here stands for 'a stage of life' as Dr. Woolner himself translates it further on P. 37, line 18.

P. 9, line 10. The translation of Sītā's words *kudo me tādiso bāhadheo*, viz., 'How did I get such luck' is not correct. Veda Vyasa and Bhanot are right when they translate 'Whence can there be such a good fortune for me?'. The idea latent in the mind of Sītā is that how can I get such a good luck as still to be called the wife of Rāma. Being exiled Sītā deplores her bad luck of having lost the position of *grhīṇitva*.

P. 9, line 16. Lakṣmaṇa begins his speech which continues till the 36th line. Then why does Dr. Woolner repeat the name of Lakṣmaṇa in the 25th line in margin, as if before it some one else was speaking? Such repetitions are to be met with again on P. 11 (of Sītā) and P. 16 (of Lakṣmaṇa).

P. 22, lines 14-15. It is wrong to translate *ārya-Hasitena saravaṁ mākarṇitam* by 'he must have heard, etc.'. It should be 'he heard'.

In the edition of Veda Vyasa and Bhanot (P. 129, fn. 2) we read that the editors have left out the following passages found in the original edition on the ground of their being meaningless :

Vi—He Rāma, piavayassa, Rāmatti khane aliamahurehim vaṇṇehiṁ āulayasi.

Rā—Kiṁ Tilottamā ?

Dr. Woolner has also left out these passages but he ought to have given a note on this.

P. 30, line 23. The word *savana* is translated by Dr. Woolner as 'evening rites', which is hardly correct. The word *savana* means 'sacrificial rites' quite alright, but it has no connection with 'evening'. Moreover, as the context itself shows, it is the description of morning :—*savanamavasitaṁ hutaṁ kṛśānāvudayagataḥ samupāsito vivasvān*. The rites here are those of the morning and not of the evening.

P. 30, line 32. 'Pale rounded cheeks' is the translation of *pāṇḍurapīnagaṇḍam* in the text. Here not only Jayacandra but even Dr. Woolner, has been led into an error. Their justification of *pīnatva* in separation is far from convincing. The text is : *lambāla-*

kaṁ pāṇḍurapīṇa-gaṇḍaṁ prasādamyaṁ vadaṇaṁ vahanī. The meaning will become quite clear if we construe *pāṇḍuḥ* (= pale *Sitā*) *lambālakaṁ apīṇagaṇḍaṁ* (with emaciated cheeks) *prasāda-ramyaṁ vadaṇaṁ vahanī*, etc.

P. 32, line 17. Dr. Woolner translates *tuṣārabinḍu* as 'snow flakes' and gives "or 'dew drops'" in the foot note.

P. 37, lines 11-12. Dr. Woolner says, 'tell me, do you both dwell together in the same place' while translating *kiṁ bhavadbhyāṁ avyavahitā bhūmīradhyāsyate*. In this Dr. Woolner has followed the explanations of Jayacandra and his co-editors again. But the sense is "What! are you sitting on the bare ground?" Rāma had asked Kuśa and Lava to get down hastily from the throne. They sat down on the ground as is evident from the stage direction *ubhāvavatiṛya bhūmāvupaviśataḥ*, and not on any seat. At that moment Rāma was very anxious to know if they were unhurt. After satisfying his mind on this point he suddenly observes that the boys (of brāhmaṇa sages, as Rāma thought uptill now) were seated on the bare ground. To this Kuśa and Lava reply:—*Mahārāja, prathamapariṇī (ṇa) to'yamarthaḥ*. "That, your Majesty, was settled (ordained?) from the first". This, of course refers to the previous speech of Vidūṣaka (p. 148 of the text in Veda Vyasa edition) where the boys use the word *bhūsthānam*.

P. 46, foot note 4. It is not necessary to change the reading *girayo* for *sarīṭe*, for it refers to the shaking or moving of mountains, which makes enough sense.

Dr. Woolner does not mention the text he follows in his translation. On the whole his efforts are laudable but unless a critical edition of the drama gives us a reliable text it is difficult to judge the merits of the poet as well as those of the translator.

Har Dutt Sharma

[This review was received in this office on Dec. 25, 1935, when Dr. Woolner was alive. We regret that Dr. Woolner is no more to reply to the points raised in the review. — Editor.]

हिंदुस्थानांतील आमच्या ठिकठिकाणच्या सफरी—सफर पहिली सन १९०९-

by Raja Raghunathrao Shankarrao Pandit, Pant Sachiv;

Published by the Private Secretary to the Raja Saheb of
Bhor, Bhor, pp. 124.

Travel undertaken for travel's sake has a charm of its own, especially when such travel is properly planned out by men of means and enjoyed with an appetising relish and care-free mind. The volume under review is a record of such travel carried out by Shrimant Rajesaheb of Bhor between 20th February and 18th April 1909 and is well illustrated containing not less than 20 beautiful pictures of important and historical places and architectural buildings visited during the travel. The book is mainly descriptive and as such would prove useful to educated persons feeling any zest for long-distance travel. For those, however, who cannot afford to undertake such a travel the book can provide much entertaining reading matter if they bring some imagination to bear on their reading of the book and put themselves in the position of the author-traveller.

It is difficult to find in modern travel books that free criticism of men and things characteristic of the travel books written by old travellers like Morco Polo or Manuci because it results from a natural self-abandon and complete identity of the observer and the observed, we mean the panorama of life through which he is dragged by the insatiable zest for travel. In the case of persons of rank the difficulty is greater still as admitted by Raje Saheb in his introductory remarks.

Every attempt has been made to make the present volume as neat and attractive as possible in point of printing and get-up. As an earnest of the future volumes in the series promised by Raje Saheb the present volume is an admirable token of the cultured taste of the author. We would, however, like to make one suggestion with regard to the illustrations to be included in the future volumes in the proposed series. Reproductions from standardised pictures if included in a book of travel divest it of

novelty and charm which generally attend a picture produced for the first time. Such reproductions, howsoever beautiful in themselves take away from a publication that touch of individuality which is rightly considered to be the very soul of an artistic publication. Even the beauty of the present volume would have been much heightened by a few out-of-the-way snaps of the varied life met with by the author during the course of his travel. We await with eagerness the publication of the future volumes in the Series as early as possible.

P. K. Gode.

**TRAVANCORE A Guide book for the visitors, By Emily
Gilchrist Hatch**

The present guide is just what a book of this kind should be—short, pleasant, racy and intelligently instructive. Travancore is indeed a marvellous and progressive state in Western India and the present guide book holds a mirror into its glorious past and picturesque present. This guide produces in the mind of the reader a very keen desire to visit Travancore. The Oxford University Press deserves our congratulations for such an excellent production—well-planned, well-written and well-illustrated.

D. V. Potdar

**Annals of the
Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute,
Volume XVII
1935-36**

EDITED BY

A. B. GAJENDRAGADKAR, M. A.,

Professor of Sanskrit, Elphinstone College, Bombay

AND

V. G. PARANJPE, M. A., LL. B., D. Litt.

Professor of Sanskrit, Fergusson College, Poona



Printed and published by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, M. A., Ph. D., at the
Bhandarkar Institute Press, Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute, Poona No. 4.

POONA

1936

CONTENTS

VOLUME XVII, PART IV

(19-10-36)

ARTICLES	PAGES
1 Countries and Peoples of India (Epic and Pauranic Sources) by Dr. Bimala Churn Law, M. A., B. L. Ph. D. ...	319-339
2 A Few Parallels in Jain and Buddhist Works by A. M. Ghatage, M. A. ...	340-350
3 The Metamorphosis of Uṣas by Prof. K. M. Shembavnekar, M. A. ...	351-357
4 Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra and Yuktikalpataru by P. A. Mankad ...	358-370
5 Further Light on Rāvaṇa's Lankā located in Central India from Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa by M. V. Kibe, M. A. ...	371-384
MISCELLANEA	
6 Śrīhaṭṭa-Nāgara and the Śrī-Gauḍa Brāhmaṇas by J. C. Ghosh ...	385-389
7 Hindu Alchemy and Modern Chemistry by J. C. Ghosh ...	390-392
8 Mahārāja Raṇabhaṇja and Rāṇaka Raṇabhaṇja by J. C. Ghosh ...	393-394
9 Notes on Indian Chronology by P. K. Gode, M. A. (XXXIV) Date of Vimalabodha's Commentary on the Mahābhārata called the Viṣamaśloki—after 1150 A. D. (XXXV) Date of Kedārabhaṭṭa's Vṛttaratnākara before A. D. 1000...	395-399
REVIEWS	
10 Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi of Vāñcheśvarayajvan, edited by M. M. Venkatasubrahmanya Shastri, reviewed by P. K. Gode, M. A. ...	400-405
11 The Mystery of the Mahābhārata, Vols. I-V, by Prof. N. V. Thadani, M. A., reviewed by S. N. Tadpatrikar, M. A. ...	406-409

- 12 **Bhāratīya Anuśṛāṇa**, reviewed by S. N.
Tadpatrikar, M. A. ... 410-412
- 13 **Evolution of Hindu Moral Ideals** by Sir S. P.
Sivaswami Aiyer, K. C. S. I., C. I. E., LL. D.,
reviewed by P. C. Divanji, M. A., LL. M. ... 413-415
- 14 **Early History of Kauśāmbī** by Nagendranath
Ghosh with an Introduction by Radhakumud
Mookerji, reviewed by K. ... 416-418
-

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

Vol. XVII]

JULY 1936

[PART IV

COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES OF INDIA*

(Epic and Pauranic Sources)

BY

Dr. BIMALA CHURN LAW, M. A., B. L., Ph. D.

DAKṢIṆĀPATHA OR SOUTHERN REGION

Athāpare janapadā Dakṣiṇāpathavāsinaḥ ।
Punḍrāsca Keralāścaiva Go-lāṅgulāstathaiva ca ॥
Śailūṣā Mūṣikāścaiva kusumā nāma vāsakāḥ ।
Mahārāṣṭrā Māhiṣakā Kalingāścaiva sarvvaśaḥ ॥
Ābhīrāḥ Sahavaiśikyā Ādhakyā Śabarāśca ye ।
Pulindā Vindhyamauleyā Vaidarbhā Daṇḍakaiḥ Saha ॥
Paurikā Maulikāścaiva Āsmakā Bhogabardhanāḥ ।
Naiśikāḥ Kuntalā Andhrā Udbhidā Vanadārakāḥ ॥

(Mārk. P. 57. 45-48).

“ Now the other peoples who dwell in the Southern Region are the Punḍras, the Keralas, the Golāṅgulas, also the Sailūṣas, and Mūṣikas, the Kusumas, the Nāmaśasakas, the Mahārāṣṭras, the Māhiśakas, and Kalingas on all sides, Ābhīras and Vaiśikyas, the Ādhakyas, and the Śabaras, the Pulindas, the Vindhyamauleyas, the people of Vidarbha, and the Daṇḍakas, the Paurikas, and the Maulikas, the Amakas, the Bhogavardhanas, the Naiśi-

* Continued from Vol. XVII part iii pp. 217-242.

kas, the Kuntalas, the Andhras, the Udbhidas, the Vanadārakas, these are the peoples of the countries of the Southern region. "

Puṇḍras— It is curious that the Puṇḍras are mentioned as a people of the South, for, they are in fact an eastern people and have been already referred to as such. Both the Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas (XLV. 124 and CXIII. 46 respectively) read Pāṇḍyas which is undoubtedly the correct reading. The Pāṇḍyas were a well-known Southern people with their capital at (Dakṣiṇa) Mathurā or modern Madurā. The country of the Pāṇḍyas comprised the modern districts of Madurā and Tinnevely. The Pāṇḍyas are often mentioned in the Mahābhārata, and sometimes in the Rāmāyaṇa as well, e. g., in the Kiṣkindhyā Kāṇḍa (XLI. 15 and 25) Vide my " Ancient India Tribes, " vol. II, Chap. IV.

Kevalas— Evidently this is a mistake for Keralas which is the reading of the Vāyu (XLV. 124) and Matsya (CXIII. 46) Purāṇas as well as of the Bhīṣma Parva of the Mahābhārata (IX. 352 and 365). According to the Mahābhārata the Keralas seem to have been a forest tribe (Sabhā P. XXX. 1174-75). In historical times they are often associated with the Colas and Pāṇḍyas, e. g., as early as in the records of Aśoka. This is upheld by the Hari-vamśa as well (XXXII. 1836).

Go-lāṅgulas— No people of this name are known. The Matsya Purāṇa reads Colas and Kulyas (CXIII. 43), and the Vāyu Caulyas and Kulyas instead (XLV. 124). The Colas (Caulyas) were a well-known people and were famous from very early times, being mentioned as early as in the inscriptions of Aśoka, as one of the four tribes of the far south. The Kulyas are not met with anywhere ; but undoubtedly they are the same people as the Kolas mentioned more than once in the Mahābhārata (Sabhā P. XXX. 1171 ; Aśvamedha P. LXXXIII. 2476-7). But the people cannot satisfactorily be identified.

Śaiṭuṣas— The Vāyu (XLV. 125) and the Matsya (CXIII. 47) Purāṇas read Setukas instead ; but none of the names can be identified. But Pargiter's suggestion¹ that they might mean the people who lived near the Setu of Rāma is ingenious and may not altogether be improbable, specially in view of

¹ Mārķ. P. 332, note.

the fact that they are mentioned in connection with people of the far south.

Mūṣikas—The Matsya Purāṇa reads Sūtikas instead (CXIII. 47). The Bhīṣma Parva list reads just as in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, but elsewhere it mentions another Southern people called Mūṣakas. It is difficult to identify them.

Kusumas—The variants are Kumanas (Vāyu, XLV. 125), and Kupathas (Matsya, CXIII. 47). Pargiter suggests an identification with the Kurubas or Kurumbas¹ who were the same as the Pallavas, an important tribe of the Deccan.

Nāma-Vāsakas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads (XLV. 125) Vana-vāsikas, and the Bhīṣma Parva list Vanavāsakas (IX. 366) which is undoubtedly the correct reading. Doubtless they refer to the people of the kingdom of Vanavāsī, a well-known region of the South in historical times, and not unknown to the author of the Harivaṃśa (XCV. 5213 and 5231-3). The Matsya Purāṇa reads Vāji-Vāsikas (CXIII. 47) which is apparently incorrect.

Maharāṣṭras—The well-known people of Mahārāṣṭra country, identical with the Rathikas and Mahārāthis of early inscriptions. In the 7th century A. D. the celebrated Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang visited the Mahārāṣṭra country. The Matsya Purāṇa reads Nava-rāṣṭras (CXIII. 47), a people located by the Mahābhārata near the land of the Kurus (Sabhā P. XXX. 1110; Virāṭa P. I, 11-12).

Māhiṣakas—or the Māhiṣikas (Matsya P. CXIII. 47). Doubtless they are identical with the Māhiṣmakas of the Mahābhārata (Aśvamedha P. LXXXIII. 2475-7), the people of Māhiṣmatī or Māndhātā, identical with modern Maheśvara or the Narmadā. Māhiṣmatī was an ancient and famous city (Mbh. Sabhā P. XXX. 1125-63), and was the border city whence began the western country (*Māhiṣmatyā parataḥ paścāddeśa*). In the Sutta-Nipāta commentary Māhiṣmatī is mentioned as an important city (Vol. II, p. 583).

Kaliṅgas—The Kaliṅgas in ancient historical tradition in the Purāṇas as well as in the epics are always associated with the

1 Ibid. P. 332, note.

Āṅgas and Vaṅgas. According to the *Harivamśa* the Kalingas along with the Āṅgas, Vaṅgas, Suhmas and Puṇḍras are said to have been descended from five eponymous brothers (Mbh. Ādi. P. CIV. 4217-21; Hariv. XXXI. 1684-93). The *Mahābhārata* tells us that the river Vaitaraṇī flowed through the country (Ādi. P. CCXV. 7820-24) and the Mahendra mountains were within its southern limits (Raghu V. IV. 38). Kalinga thus seems to have been conterminous with modern Orissa within the district of Ganjam.

Ābhīras—The Ābhīras of the Deccan must be a branch of the northern tribe of the same name. (For the migration of the tribe to different regions in the north and south see my *Ancient Indian Tribes* Vol. II, pp. 51-54). The *Matsya Purāṇa* reads Kāruṣas instead, the same as Karuṣas (For Kāruṣas or Karuṣas see my *Ancient Indian Tribes*, Vol. II, pp. 31-33).

Vaiśikyas—The variants are Eṣikas (Vāyu P. XLV. 126) and Aiṣikas (Matsya P. CXIII. 48); but it is difficult to identify them.

Āḍhakyas—The Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas (XLV. 126 and CXIII. 48 respectively) read Āṭavyas which is no doubt the correct reading. Āṭavi as a city of the Deccan is mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* (Sabhā P. XXX. 1176). The Āṭavyas were certainly the same as the Āṭavikas of the Allahabad Pillar inscription of Samudragupta, who were perhaps aboriginal tribes dwelling in the jungle tracts of Central India.

Śabaras—Admittedly they were an aboriginal tribe mentioned in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (Ādi K. I, 59; Aranya K. LXXVII. 6-32) as well as in the *Mahābhārata* (Śānti P. LXV. 2429; CLXVIII. 6294-6303; CLXXIII. 6445) as living in the forest regions of Central India and the Deccan. The Śabaras can still be found in the interiors of Orissa, as well as in those of Central India and the Deccan under the names of Sabar, Saur, etc. (For references to the tribe see *Indian Culture*, Vol. I, no. 2, p. 305). They are almost always associated with such rude non-Aryan tribes as the Pulindas, Mutibas, Ābhīras, Pukkusas etc.

Pulindas—The Pulindas are referred to in the Purāṇas as dwelling in the northern and western regions as well. Apparently

they were a rude non-Aryan tribe scattered in different parts of India. The Pulindas of the Dakṣiṇāpatha were probably an offshoot of the northern Pulindas. (For a detailed account of the tribe see Indian Culture, Vol. I, no. 3, pp. 383-4). For an origin of the Pulindas, Vide Mahāvamśa (P. T. S.) p. 69.

Vindhya-mauleyas-- The Matsya Purāṇa erroneously reads Vindhya-puṣikas (CXIII. 48), but the Vāyu reads Vindhya-mūlikas (XLV. 126). No particular people of the name are known, but the name may mean the " people who live at the foot of the Vindhyas. "

Vidarbhas— The Vidarbhas were a famous people and known from very early times; their country was one of the most renowned kingdoms in the Deccan. In the time of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 34), Bhīma was the king of Vidarbha. The country is also mentioned in the Jāiminiya Brāhmaṇa (II, 440; Ved. Ind. II, 297) as also in a number of Jātakas. It seems to have been one of the earliest Aryan kingdoms in the Deccan. According to the Paurāṇic account of the Yādavas, Vidarbha, the eponymous leader of the Vidarbhas was a Yādava (Matsya. XLIV. 36; Vāyu, 95. 35-36). According to the Mahābhārata (III. 73. 1-2) as well as the Harivaṃśa (Viṣṇu Parva, 60) Kuṇḍiṇa, represented by the modern town of Kauṇḍinyapura in Amaraoti, on the banks of the Vardhā, was the capital of the Vidarbha country. Its most famous king, according to epic tradition (Mbh. Vana P. CXVII. 6590-1) was Bhīsmaka.

Daṇḍakas— They are undoubtedly the people dwelling in the Daṇḍaka forests, made famous in the Rāmāyaṇa in connection with the story of Rāmā's exile. According to the description as given in the Rāmāyaṇa, the forest seems to have covered almost the whole of Central India from the Bundelkhand region to the Godāvari (J. R. A. S., 1894 p. 241; cf. Fausboll Jātaka, Vol. V. p. 29), but the Mahābhārata seems to limit the Daṇḍaka forest to the source of the Godāvari (Sabhā P. XXX. 1169; Vana P. LXXXV. 8183-4).

Paurikas— The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Paunikas instead (XLV. 127), perhaps erroneously. According to the Harivaṃśa, Purikā was a city in the Māhiṣmatī kingdom (XCV. 5220-8). It is not improbable that Purikā was the city of the Paurikas.

Maulikas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Maunikas (XLV. 127) instead ; the Sabhā Parva of the Mahābhārata refers to a people named Mauleyas. The Maulikas were evidently the people of Mūlaka mentioned in the Pārāyanavagga of the Sutta Nipāta. (For an account of the Mūlakas see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II, p. 26).

Aśmakas— They are a famous ancient Indian tribe referred to in ancient Greek accounts and Sanskrit and Pāli literature. (For a full account of the tribe, see my Ancient Indian Tribes, p. 86).

Bhogavardhanas— The tribe cannot satisfactorily be identified. Bhogavādham occurs in the Barhut Inscriptions (Vide Barua and Sinha, Barhut Inscriptions, p. 15.).

Naiṣikas— The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Nairṇikas (XLV. 127) but none of these names can be identified. Pargiter suggests an identification with the Nāsikyās or the people of Nasik, mentioned in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (LVIII. 24).

Kuntalas— The Kuntalas were a well-known people of the South, mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma P. IX. 367 , Karṇa P. XX, 779) as well as in inscriptions. They occupied a region almost coterminous with the Kanarese districts.

Andhras— The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Andhras instead (XLV. 127) which is undoubtedly the correct reading. They were a famous and well-known people who founded a kingdom in the third century A. D. In very early times they seem to have been rude people (Sabhā P. IV. 119 ; XXX. 1175 ; Vana P. LI. 1988), and were probably non-Aryans, for they are always mentioned with such tribes as the Pulindas, Śabaras, Kirātas, Ābhiras, etc.

Udbhidas— The tribe cannot be identified.

Vana-dārakas— The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Nala-Kālikas (XLV. 127). The tribe cannot be identified.

APARĀNTA OR WESTERN COUNTRY

.....Aparāntān nivodha me ।
 Sūryārakāḥ Kālibalā Durgāścānikataiḥ saha ॥
 Pulindāśca Sumināśca Rūpapāḥ Svāpadaiḥ saha ।
 Tathā Kuruminaścaiva Sarvve caiva Kāṭhākṣarāḥ ॥
 Nāsikyāvāśca ye c'ānye ye caivottaranarmmadāḥ ।
 Bhīrukacchā samāheyāḥ saha Sārasvatairapi ॥
 Kāśmīrāśca Surāṣṭrāśca Āvantiyāścārbudaiḥ saha ।
 Ityete hyaparāntāḥ.....

(Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, 57. 49-52)

“ Hear from me the names of the Western peoples: the Sūryārakas, the Kālibalas and the Durgas, and the Anikaṭas, and the Pulindas, and the Sumīnas, the Rūpapas, and the Svāpadas, and the Kurumīnas, and all the Kāṭhākṣaras, and the others who are called Nāsikyavas and the others who live on the north bank of the Narmadā the Bhīrukacchas, and the Maheyas, and the Sārasvatas also and the Kāśmīras, and the Surāṣṭras, and the Āvantiyas and the Arbudas also. These are the western people.”

(Pargiter. *Mārka P.*, pp. 338-40).

Sūryārakas—Doubtless this is a misreading for Śūrpārakas. The Śūrpāraka country was known from very early times, and is celebrated in the Mahābhārata in connection with the legend of Rāma Jāmadagnya (Vana P. LXXXV. 8185). There it is located in the western region, but some passages seem to locate it in the south as well (Sabhā P. XXX. 1169, Vana P. LXXXVIII. 8337). This does not mean that there were two Śūrpārakas; the fact is that the situation of Śūrpāraka has been interpreted in some passages as west and in other passages as south, because it was near the southern sea in the western region. According to the same tradition the country was situated on the sea near Prabhāsa (Vana P. CXVIII. 10221-7) identical with modern Somanath in Kathiawar. The city of Śūrpāraka, identical with the modern town of Sopārā near Bassein, is said to have been founded by Rāma Jāmadagnya (Hariv. XCVI. 5300).

Kālibalas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Kolavanas (XLV. 128), but none of the names is identifiable.

Durga-- The Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 359) of the Mahābhārata gives a similar name, Durgalas, but the names are not identifiable.

Anikaḷās-- The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Kolavanas (XLV. 128) but the names are not identifiable.

Pulindas-- The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Puleyas (XLV. 129 and Matsya Kuliya (CXIII. 49). These names are not identifiable. For the Pulindas, however, see note on the tribe above.

Suminas-- The Vāyu Purāṇa (XLV. 129) reads Surālas and the Matsya Sirālas (CXIII. 49). None of these names are identifiable.

Rūpapas-- The variants are Rūpasas (Vāyu, XLV. 129 ; Matsya, CXIII. 49) and Rupāvāhikas (Bhīṣma P. IX. 351). They are not identifiable.

Svāpadas-- The Vāyu and Matsya read Tāpasas (XLV. 129 ; CXIII. 49 respectively). They are not identifiable.

Kurumins-- The variants are Turasitas (Vāyu, XLV. 129), Taittirikas (Matsya, CXIII. 49) which is almost similar to Tittiras (Bhīṣma P. L. 2084). They cannot be identified.

Nāsikyavas-- The Nāsikyas are certainly the people of Nāsik. The Matsya Purāṇa reads Vāsikas which is evidently a mistake.

Kathākṣaras-- The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Pārakṣaras (XLV. 129) and the Matsya Kārakṣaras (CXIII. 49). They are not identifiable.

Bhirukacchas--The Matsya Purāṇa reads Bhārūkakchas (CXIII. 50) who are the same people, namely the Bhṛgukacchas of Sanskrit literature. Bhṛgukaccha, Bharukaccha, Bhīrukaccha are all identifiable with the modern Broach or Bharuch which is the Barygaza of early Greek geographers.

Māheyas-- They must have been the people dwelling along the banks of the Māhi. The Māheyas are the same as the Māhikas of the Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 354).

Sārasvatas-- The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Sahasas and Sāsṁvatas instead (XLV. 130); but these names are not identifiable. The Sārasvatas are of course the people dwelling along the Sarasvatī, the river that flows into the sea past Prabhāsa, i. e. modern Somnath (Vana P. LXXXII. 5002-4 ; Śālya P. XXXVI. 2048-51).

Kāśmīras-- Evidently it is a misreading, for the Kāśmīras

can in no way be located in the western region. The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Kacchviyas (XLV. 131) and the Matsya Kacchikas (CXIII. 51); these are undoubtedly the correct readings and mean the people of Kaccha or Cutch.

Surāṣṭras—The Surāṣṭras are frequently mentioned in the Mahābhārata, and were a famous people. (For an account of the tribe see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II. pp. 23 ff.).

Avantyas—They are undoubtedly the people of Avantī (For an account of the tribe see my Ancient Mid-Indian Kṣatriya Tribes, Vol. I. pp. 139-155). But the reading as given in the Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas (XLV. 131 and CXIII. 51 respectively) is perhaps better. They read Ānarta whose capital was Dvārakā or Dvārāvati, the modern Dwarka on the sea-shore. (Śānti P. CCCXLI. 12955 ; Hariv. CXIII. 6265-6).

Arbudās—They must have been the people dwelling on the mount Arbuda which is the ancient name for Mount Abu.

PEOPLES AND COUNTRIES OF THE VINDHYAN REGION

.....Śṛṇu Vindhyanivāsinaḥ ||
 Saraśāśca Karūṣāśca Keralāścotkalaiḥ saha |
 Uttamarṇā Daśārṇāśca Bhojyāḥ Kiśkindhakaiḥ saha ||
 Tosalāḥ Kośalāścaiva Traipurā Vaidīśastathā |
 Tumburāstumbulāścaiva Paṭavo Naiṣadhaiḥ saha ||
 Annajāstusṭikārāśca Virahotrāhyavantayaḥ |
 Ete janapadāḥ Sarve Vindhyaṇṛṣṭhanivāsinaḥ ||
 (Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, 57. 52-55).

“ Hear the inhabitants of the Vindhya Mountains. The Sarajas, and Karūṣas, and the Keralas, and Utkalas, the Uttamarṇas, and the Daśārṇas, the Bhojyas, and the Kiśkindhakas, the Tosalas, and the Kośalias, the Traipuras and the Vaidīśas, the Tumburas, and the Tumbulas, the Paṭus and the Naiṣadhas, Annajas, and the Tuṣṭikāras, the Virahotras and the Avantis. All these people dwell on the slopes of the Vindhya Mountains. ”
 (Pargiter, Mārkaṇḍeya P. pp. 340-44).

Sarajas—The Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇa read Mālavas (XLV. 132 and CXIII. 52 respectively), which no doubt is the correct reading. The Mālavas, it is well-known, had settlements in 2 [Annals, B. O. R. I.]

different parts of India (For an account of the tribe see my *Ancient Indian Tribes*, Vol. II, pp. 37 ff.); the tribe referred to here may probably mean that branch of the Mālavas which settled in and around that portion of Malwa which borders on the Vindhya. The Mālavas are again and again mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Sabhā P. XXXIII. 1270, LI. 1871 ; Vana P. CCLIII. 15256, etc.).

Karūṣas— They are the same as the Kārūṣas, and Kārūṣakas (For an account of the tribe, see my *Ancient Indian Tribes*, Vol. II, pp. 31-33).

Keralas— This is undoubtedly wrong, for the Keralas cannot in any way be placed on the slopes of the Vindhya, they being a people of the far South. The Vāyu (XLV. 132) and the Matsya Purāṇas (CXIII. 52) read Mekalas which seems to be the correct reading. The Mekalas are those people who dwelt on the Mekala hills and the country around. They are coupled in early Indian literature and inscriptions either with the Ambaṣṭhas or with the Utkalas. (Bhīṣma P. IX. 348 ; Drona P. IV. 122 etc.). (For an account of the tribe see my *Ancient Indian Tribes*, Vol. II, p. 28).

Utkalas— They were a well-known people in ancient India though they are not often mentioned in the epics. According to the Raghuvamśa (IV. 38), their territory bordered in the east on the river Kapiśā, probably the modern Kasai in Midnapur. Utkala seems to have comprised the southern portion of Chotanagpur and almost the whole of the modern province of Orissa except Puri and Cuttack.

Uttamarnas— The Matsya Purāṇa reads Aundramāṣas (CXIII. 52) but none of these names are identifiable. The Uttamarnas are however presumably the Uttanas of Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 348) of the Mahābhārata.

Daśārṇas— They are evidently the people of the country watered by the river of the same name identified with the modern Dasan, a tributary of the Jumna. The capital of the country was Vidiśā, situated on the river Vetravati, the modern Betwa. The people and their kingdom are referred to frequently in the Mahābhārata (Ādi. P. CXIII. 4449 ; Vana P. LXIX. 2707-8 ; Udyoga P. CXC-CXCI11 ; Bhīṣma P. IX. 348, 350, 363, Vide also my *Ancient Indian Tribes*, Vol. II, pp. 29-30).

Bhojyas—The *Vāyu* (XLV. 132) and *Matsya Purāṇas* (CXIII 52) read Bhojas which is undoubtedly a better and more probable reading. It is well-known that the Bhojas who are frequently mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* (Vana P. XIV. 629, XX. 791, CXVI. 10172-6, CCLIII. 15245; *Mausala* P. VII. 244-45; *Hariv.* XXXVII. 1980-87, etc.) were a Yādava tribe and dwelt in north-eastern Gujrat. The Bhojas referred to here may have been a branch of the main tribe inhabiting the western slopes of the Vindhya. (For further details regarding the tribe see my "Some Ancient Indian Tribes," *Indian Culture*, Vol. I, No. 3, pp. 384-86).

Kiṣkindhaks—It is doubtful that they are identical with the people of Kiṣkindhyā mentioned in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, for Kiṣkindhyā of *Rāmāyaṇa* was situated far below in the South. In the circumstances it is not easy to identify the tribe.

Tosalas—The *Matsya Purāṇa* reads Stosalas (CXIII. 53) evidently erroneously, for Tosalas is correct reading meaning the people of Tosali or Tosala and the adjoining region. Tosali or Tosala was name of a country as well as of a city. The city of Tosali was the seat of the provincial government of Kalinga in the days of Aśoka; while the country or janapada of "Amita-Tosala" is referred to in the *Gaṇḍavyūha*¹ along with its city Tosala. In Pauranic literature, Tosala is always associated with Dakṣiṇa Kosala, and distinguished from Kalinga. Tosala in mediæaval times seems to have been divided into two parts: Dakṣiṇa Tosala and Uttara Tosala (Ep. Ind. IX. 286; XV. 3). The city of Tosala seems to have been the same as Tosalei of Ptolemy.

Kosalas—These are undoubtedly the people of Mahā-Kosala or Dakṣiṇa-Kosala, well-known in early literature and inscriptions. Vide my *Ancient Indian Tribes*, pp. 34-85.

Traipuras—They are the people of Tripuri or Tripura which was both a city and a country. The city of Tripuri was the capital of the Cedi kingdom. It was a well-known city that derived its name from three cities or *tri-pura* once in possession of the asuras (Sabhā P. XXX. 1164; Vana P. CCLIII. 15246; *Kaṇva* P. XXXIII

¹ Levi, *Pre-Aryan et Pre-Dravidian dans l'Inde*, J. A., Jul.—Sept. 1923.

and XXXIV). In the time of the Guptas Tripuri-visaya was formed into a province under a viceroy; it roughly corresponded to the modern Jubbulpur region which was the ancient Cedi country.

Vaidīṣas—These are undoubtedly the people of Vidiśā, a famous city of early times, the capital of the Daśārṇa country, both immortalised by Kālidāsa in his Meghadūtam. Vidiśā is probably the modern Bes-nagar, close to Bhilsa; it was situated on the river Vetravati, modern Betwa.

Tumburas and Tumbulas—The Matsya Purāṇa reads Tumburas (CXIII. 53) and the Bhīṣma Parva gives (L. 2084) Tumbumas. Closely allied to them were probably the Tumbulas where the Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas read Tumuras and Tumbaras respectively. These names cannot be identified.

Paṭus—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Ṣaṭsuras (XLV. 133) and Matsya Padgamas (CXIII. 53). None of these names are identifiable.

Naiṣadhas—or Nisadhas, the people of Niṣadha. (For an account of the tribe see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II. pp. 63ff.).

Annajas—Evidently this, and the Matsya Purāṇa reading of Arūpas (CXIII. 54), are erroneous. The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Anūpas (XLV. 134) which undoubtedly is correct. The country of the Anūpas must have been situated somewhere on the sea. King Kārttavīrya (Vana P. CXVI. 16189-90) as well as king Nala lorded over the Anūpa country (Bhīṣma P. XCV. 4210) which is probably to be sought for somewhere near Surāṣṭra and Anarta with which the Harivaṃśa associates Anūpa (XCIV. 5142-80). Evidently the country was included within the sphere of the Māhiṣmatī.

Tuṣṭikāras—Doubtless it is a misreading. The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Tuṇḍikeras (XLV. 134) which is supported by the Mahābhārata (Droṇa P. XVII. 691; Karṇa P. V. 138) and the Harivaṃśa (XXXIV. 1895). According to the Harivaṃśa, they belonged to the Haihaya race (ibid). The tribe seems to have left their trace in the little town of Tendukheṛa, a little to the

north of the source of the Narmadā (Pargiter, *Mārk. P.* p. 344 note). The *Matsya Purāṇa* reading of *Saundikeras* is incorrect.

Virahotras—The *Vāyu* and *Matsya Purāṇas* read *Vitihotras* (XLV. 134; CXIII. 54) which is undoubtedly correct. Presumably they were descended from king *Vitihotra* and were a branch of the *Haihaya* race (*Hariv.* XXXIV. 1895). A variant of their name is given in the *Droṇa Parva* of the *Mahābhārata* (LXX. 2436). The name *Virahotra* or *Varahotra* is met with in the *Sāñci* Inscriptions of the 2nd century B. C.

Arantis—They were an important tribe in ancient India who had their capital at *Ujjain*. (For a fuller account of the tribe see my *Ancient Mid-Indian Kṣatriya Tribes*, Vol. I., pp. 139-155).

PARVATĀŚRAYIN OR THE PEOPLE OF THE MOUNTAIN (OR HIMĀLAYAN) REGION

Ato dēsān pravakṣyāmi parvvatāśrayinaśca ye |
Nihārā Haṁsamārgāśca Kuravo gurganāḥ Khasāḥ ||
Kunta-Prāvaranāścaiva Ūrṇā Dārvvā Sakṛtrakāḥ |
Trigarttā Mālavāścaiva Kirātāstāmasaiḥ saha ||

(*Mārk. P. Chap.* 57. 56-57).

“Next I will tell you also the names of the countries which rest against the Mountains (i. e., the countries of the *Himālayan* region). The *Nihāras*, and the *Haṁsamārgas*, the *Kurus*, the *Gurganās*, the *Khasas*, and the *Kunta-prāvaranās*, the *Urpas*, the *Dārvas*, the *Sakṛtrakas*, the *Trigarttas*, the *Gālavas*, the *Kirātas* and the *Tāmasas*.”

(Pargiter, *Mārk. P.* pp. 345-47).

Nihāras—The *Vāyu Purāṇa* reads *Nigarharas* (XLV. 135) and the *Matsya Nirāhāras* (CXIII. 55). None of these names are identifiable; but *Nihāras* may generally mean those people dwelling on the snowy (*nihāra*) slopes of the *Himālayas*.

Haṁsamārgas—They cannot satisfactorily be identified.

Kurus—These must be the *Uttara Kurus*, a semi-mythical country referred to frequently in both the epics as well as in early *Pāli* literature. Their country cannot definitely be identi-

fied, but presumably it was somewhere beyond Kasmir on the other side of the Himālayas.

Gurganas—The Matsya Purāṇa reads A-pathas (CXIII. 55). But none of them can be identified.

Khasas—The Khasas presumably a non-Aryan tribe, and foreign as well. In the epic tradition the Khasas are associated with the Sakas, Daradas etc. (Sabhā P. LI. 1859; Droṇa P. XI. 399; and CXXI. 4846-47), and were considered *mlecchas* (Hariv. XCV. 6440-41. XIV. 784).

Kunta-prāvaranas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Kuṣa-prāvaranas (XLV. 136). The Mahābhārata often (e. g., Sabhā P. LI. 1875; Bhīṣma P. LI. 2103) speaks of a people called Karṇa-prāvaranas who probably are meant. But they cannot definitely be identified.

Urṇas—They have already been mentioned as a northern people.

Dārvas—The have also been mentioned as a northern people.

Sakṛtrakas—Perhaps the Śakridgrahas of the Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 373) are meant. They were a rude non-Aryan tribe, but they cannot definitely be identified.

Trigarttas—For a full account of the tribe see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II, pp. 55 ff.

Gālavas—They were probably those people who claimed their descent from sage Gālava, but they cannot be definitely identified.

Kirātas—They were a rude non-Aryan tribe distributed in different regions of India. (For a full account of the tribe see *Indian Culture*, Vol. I, on. 3. pp. 381-82 my article on "Some Ancient Indian Tribes").

Tāmasas—They have already been mentioned as a northern people, but cannot satisfactorily be identified.

COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES OF INDIA ARRANGED ACCORDING TO THE POSITION OF THE KŪRMA

Here we practically come to an end of the geographical (i. e. Navakhaṇḍa) canto (i. e. Chap. 57) of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa,

which in fact contains the strictly geographical information of other major Purāṇas. But the Mārkaṇḍeya has also another section (Chap. 58, i. e., the Kūrmavibhāga or the Kūrma nivāsa) containing a list of countries and peoples of India arranged according to the position of the country conceived as a tortoise as it lies on the water resting upon Viṣṇu and looking Eastwards. This arrangement is based, on earlier astronomical works like those of Parāśara and Varāhamihira. This chapter though not strictly geographical contains valuable topographical information. Most of these countries and peoples have already been mentioned in the Navakhaṇḍa section but there are good many names which are new, though quite a number of them cannot be satisfactorily identified. Here I propose to deal with only the additional names of peoples and countries mentioned in the Kūrma Vibhāga.

(a) *In the middle of the tortoise*

The Vedamantras and the Vimāṇḍavyas cannot satisfactorily be identified.

Śālvas, Śālyas and Śālveyas are one and the same people, and are frequently mentioned in the Mahābhārata, where their location is suggested to have been near the Kurus and Trigarttas (Virāṭa P. I. 11-12; XXX). The story of Satyavān, a Śālya (or Śālva) prince and Sāvitrī, a Madra princess, is quite well-known. In the time of the Kurukṣetra war the Śālva king was an important personage, a brother of King Śīsupāla of Cedi (Hariv. CVIII. 6029, Vana P. XIV. 620-7). The Śālvas seem to have occupied some region west of the Aravalli hills and not very far from Kṛṣṇa's country, for, in the Harivaṁśa the Śālva king is said to have once attacked Dvārāvātī, but was killed by Kṛṣṇa in retaliation (Droṇa P. XI. 395).

It is difficult to say where the Nīpas had their habitat: but one can gather that they descended from king Nīpa, a Paurava, who had his capital in Kāmpilya, modern Kampil on the Ganges (Mbh. Ādi. P. CXXXVIII. 5512-13; Matsya P. XLIX. 52 and 53; Hariv. XX. 1060-73). Later, they came to be regarded as degraded (Sabhā. P. XLIX. 1804; L. 1844).

The Śakas were a well-known foreign tribe, classed with the

Yavanas, Kambojas, Pahlavas, Tukhāras, Khasas, etc., and considered mlecchas in Indian historical tradition as contained in the Epics and Purānas.

Ujjihānas are difficult to be identified; but Pargiter suggests their probable association with Urjihāna, a town situated south-east of Hastināpur, identical probably with Ujhani about 11 miles south-west of Budaon.

The Ghosa-Sāmkhyas cannot be identified.

Dharmāranya is to be identified with a forest near Gayā (Vana P. LXXXIV. 8063-4; Anusāsana P. XXV. 1744; CLXV. 7655; Vana P. LXXXVII. 8304-8).

The Jyotiṣikas and the Gauragrivas cannot be satisfactorily identified, nor can we identify definitely the Sanketas, the Kāṅkas the Mārutas, the Kāla-Koṭiṣas, the Pāṣaṇḍas, and the Kapiṅgalas.

The Kuruvāhyas must necessarily include the Kurus, but it is difficult to say who are the other races meant.

The Uḍumbaras are certainly the Audumbaras of the Mahābhārata (Sabhā P. LI. 1869). Lassen identifies Uḍumbara country with Cutch (Ind. Att. map.); but this is doubtful, for, here they are placed in the Madhyadeśa. There was a river Uḍumbarāvatī in the South (Hariv. CLXVIII. 9511).

The Gajāhvayas are the same as the people of Hastināpura which is also known as Gajapura, Gajāhvaya, Gajasāhvaya, Nāgapura, Nāgasāhvaya, Vāraṇāhvaya and Vāraṇa-sāhvaya, in the Mahābhārata. All the names are coined by playing on the meaning of the word 'hasti', i. e. elephant.

(b) *In the face of the Tortoise*

The Vadana-danturas, the Candreśvaras, the cannibals dwelling on the seacoast, and the Ekapādapas cannot be identified.

The Subhras were the same people as the Suhmas.

The mention of the Khasas as situated in different parts of the Tortoise's body suggests that the tribe, a mleccha one, was distributed over different localities of India; so with the Ābhiras and similar tribes.

The Lauhityas are certainly those people dwelling along the

Lauhitya river, i. e. the Brahmaputra. This is further supported by the fact that they are mentioned just after the Prāgiyotiṣas.

The Kaśāyas probably mean the people of Kāśī; if so they are certainly misplaced here.

The Mekhalāmūstas is a curious reading; almost certainly it stands for the Mekalas and the Ambaṣṭhas, mixed up by the copyist in a curious compound. For an account of the two tribes see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II, pp. 28 and 34-36).

The Vardhamānas are certainly the people who lived in the ancient *viśaya* or *bhūkti* of Vardhamāna identical with modern Burdwan.

(c) *In the Tortoise's fore-foot*

The Jaṭharas, the Mr̥ṣikas, the Ūrdhva-Karṇas, the Nārikelas, the Dharmadvīpas, the Elikas, the Vyāghragrīvas, the Mahāgrīvas, the Haimakūṭas (the Himālayas cannot be meant here) and the Kākulālakas cannot be identified; some of these names are indeed fanciful.

The Katakasthalas are indeed the people of Kaṭaka (modern Cuttack).

The naked Hārikas may mean the Hāḍis of modern times, an aboriginal tribe, now found scattered all over western Bengal and Orissa.

The Niṣādas were an aboriginal race dwelling generally in forest tracts. (For an account of the tribe see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II, pp. 63-64).

The Parṇa-śavaras were evidently a branch of the Savaras who lived on leaves or who wore leaves.

(d) *In the Tortoise's right flank*

Laṅkā is Ceylon.

The Kālājinās, the Śailikas, the Nikatas, the Sarvas, the Akaṇin people, the Gonarddhas, the Kolagiras, those who inhabit Carmapaṭṭa, the Ganavāhyas, the Paras, the Vāricaras, those who have their dwelling in Kṛṣṇadvīpa, the peoples who live by the Sūrya hill and the Kumuda hill, the Aukhāvanas, the Pīśikas, the Karma-nāyakas, the Tāpasāśramas, and the people who dwell in Kuñjara-darī.

The Dāsāpuras are the people of Daśāpura (or Mandasor), the capital of king Ranti-deva (Megha D. I, 46-48).

The Citrakūṭas are the people living on the mount Citrakūṭa, still known by the same name.

The Southern Kaurūsas were a branch of the Kāruṣa or Karuṣa race already discussed.

The Rṣabhas are the people dwelling on the Rṣabha parvata identified with the southern portion of the Eastern Ghats.

Kāñci is modern Conjeeveram.

Tilāṅgas should properly be read as Tailāṅgas or Tri-liṅgas, people of Teliṅga or the modern Telugu country.

Kaccha, the same as Kochchi, the modern Cochin in Travancora.

Tāmraparṇī is the land perhaps on both sides of the river of the same name in the extreme south. There is also a town of the same name in Ceylon which itself is also sometimes known as Tāmraparṇī.

(e) *In the Outer foot*

The Vadavā-mukhas, the Vanitā-mukhas, the Drāvapas, the Sārgigas, the Karna-prādheyas, the Pāraśavas (perhaps those who claimed descent from Paraśurāma), the Kalas, the Dhūr-takas, the Haimagirikas, the Sindhukālakavairatas and the Mahārjavas cannot be satisfactorily identified.

(f) *In the Tortoise's tail*

The Śāntikas, the Vipraśastakas, the Kokāṅkaṇas, the Pañcadakas, the Vamanas, the Avaras, the Tārakṣuras, the Āngatakas, the Śarkaras, the Śālma-vesmakas, the Guru-svaras (evidently a branch of the Savaras), the Phalguṇakas, the Ghoras, the Gurahas, the Kalas, the Ekeṣṇas, the Vāji-keśas, the Dirgha-grivas and the Aśva-keśas cannot be satisfactorily identified.

(g) *In the Tortoise's left hind foot*

The Māṇdavyas (probably those who claimed descent from sage Māṇdavya), the Candakhāras, the Aśvakalantakas, the Kunyatāladahas, the Strivāhyas, the Bālikas, the Nṛsimhas, the people who dwell in Valāva, the Dharmabaddhas, the Alūkas (probably the Ulūkas), and the people who occupy Urukarna cannot be satisfactorily identified.

The Bālikas are evidently the Bāhlikas.

(h) *In the Tortoise's left flank*

The Krauñcas, the Vakas, the Kṣudravīpas, the Rasālayas, the Bhogaprasthas (perhaps Bhojaprastha=Bhojanagara, the capital of king Uśīnara), the Agñījyas, the Sārdana peoples, the Aśvamukhas, the Prāptas, the Civiḍas, the Dāserakas, the Adhama-Kairātas, the Ambālas, the Venukas, the Vadantikas, the Piṅgalas, the Mānakalahas, the Kohalakas, the Bhūti-yuvakas, the Śātakas, the Hema-tārakas, the Yaśomatyas, the Khara-sāgara-rāsis, the Dāsameyas, the Rājanyas, the Śyāmakas, and the Ksemadhūrtas cannot be satisfactorily identified.

Yāmunas— They are the people who dwelt along the Jamunā.

Antar-dvīpa is the same as the Antar-vedi, the land between the Ganges and the Jamunā.

For an account of the Yaudheyas see my *Ancient Indian Tribes*, Vol. II, pp. 43-44.

(i) *In the Tortoise's north-east foot*

The Yenas, the Kīmnaras, the country Prasupāla, the country Kicaka, the Davadas, the Vana-rāṣṭrakas, the Sairiṣṭhas, the Brahmapurakas, the Vana-vāhyakas, the Kauśikas, the Ānandas, the Lolanas, the Dārvādas, the Marakas, the Kuruṭas, the Annadāarakas, the Eka-pādas, the Ghoṣas, the Svarga-bhaumānavadyakas, the Hīngas, the Cīraprāvaraṇas and the Trinetras cannot satisfactorily be identified.

The Abhisāras are the people of the Abhisāra country, the Abhisaras of early Greek geographers, a people of the Punjab. Their capital Abhisāri is mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Sabhā P. XXVI. 1097 Bhiṣma P. IX. 361).

The Kulatas are evidently the Kulutas, presumably the people of the Kulu valley.

The Pauravas are evidently those who claimed descent from Puru, a son of Yayāti. The Pauravas had different settlements (Cf. Mbh. Sabhā P. XXVI. 1022-25; Śānti P. XLIX. 1790-92; Adi. P. CLXXXVI. 6995).

APPENDIX

Full list of countries and peoples of India mentioned in the Kūrmavibhāga.

(a) In the middle of the tortoise are placed the following countries and peoples :

The Vedamantras, Vimāṇavyas, Śālvas, Nīpas, Śakas, Ujjihānas, Ghoṣa-sāṁkhyas, Khaśas, Śārasvatas, Matsyas, Śūrasenas, people of Mathurā, Dharmāraṇyas, Jyotiṣikas, Gauragrīvas, Guḍas, Āsmakas, Vaidehakas, Pāñcālas, Saṅketas, Kaṅkas, Mārutas, Kālakotīśas, Pāṣaṇḍas, inhabitants of the Pāripātra mountains, Kāpiṅgalas, Kuruvāhyas Uḍumbaras and the Gajāhvayas.

(b) In the face of the tortoise are situated the following countries and peoples :

The people of Mithilā, the Subhras, Vadanadanturas, Candreśvaras, Khaśas, Magadhas, Prāgyotīśas, and the Lauhityas, the Cannibals who dwell on the sea-coast, Kaṣayas, Mekhalāmuṣṭas, Tāmrāliptas, Ekapādapas, Vardhamānas, and the Kośalas.

(c) The following countries and peoples are situated in the Tortoise's right fore-foot :

The Kāliṅgas, Vaṅgas, Jātharas, Kośalas, Mṛṣikas, Cedis, Ūrdhvakarāṇas, Matsyas, others who dwell on the Vindhya mountains, Vidarbhas, Nārikelas, Dharmadvīpas, Elikas, Vyāghragrīvas, Mahāgrīvas, the bearded Traipuras, Kaiśkindhyas, Haimakūtas, Niṣadhas, Kaṭakasthalas, Daśārṇas, the naked Hārikas, Niṣādas Kākulālakas and the Parṇasavaras.

(d) The following countries and peoples are placed on the right flank of the tortoise :

Laṅkā, the Kālājīnas, Śailikas, Nikatas, those who dwell on the Mahendra and Malaya mountains and the Durdura hill, those who dwell in the Karkotaka forest, Bhṛgukacchas, Koṅkanas, Sarvas, Ābhiras, those who dwell on the river Venvā, Avantis, Dāsapurās, the Ākaṇi people, Mahā-rāṣṭras, Karṇātas, Gonarddhas, Citrakūtakas, Colas, Kolagiras, the people who wear matted hair (Jātadhara) in Krauñcadvīpa, the people who dwell on the Kāveri and on mount Rṣyamukha, those who are called Nāsikyās, those who wander by the borders of the Śaṅkha and Śukti and other hills and Vaidūrya mountains, Vāricaras, Kolas those who inhabit the Carmapatta, the Gaṇavāhyas, Paras, those who dwell in Kṛṣṇadvīpa, the peoples who dwell near the Sūrya hill and the Kumuda hill, Aukhāvanas, Piśikas, Karmaṇyākas, southern Karūṣas, Rṣikas, Tāpasāśrama, Rṣabhas, Siṁhalas, those who inhabit Kāñci, Tilāṅgas, those inhabit Kuñjaradari and Kaccha and Tāmraparṇi.

(e) The countries and peoples located in the right hand foot are the following :

The Kāmbojas, Pahlavas, Baḍavāmukhas, Sindhus, Sauvīras, Ānartas, Vanitāmukhas, Drāvaṇas, Sārgigas, Śūdras, Karpapradheyas, Varvaras, Kirātas, Pāradas, Pāṇdyas, Pārasavas Kalas, Dhūrtakas, Haimagirikas, Sindhu-Kālaka-Vairatas, Saurāṣṭras, Daradas, Drāviḍas, and the Mahārṇavas.

(f) The countries and peoples situated on the tortoise's tail are the following :

The Aparāntikas, Haihayas, Śāntikas, Viprasastakas, Kokaṅkaras, Pañcadakas, Vamanas, Avaras, Tārakśuras, Āngatakas, Śālma-veśmakas, Gurusvaras, Phalgupakas, the people who dwell by the river Veṇumatī, Phalgulukas, Ghoras, Guruhās, Kalas, Ekeksaṇas, Vājikeśas Dirghagrīvas, Cūlikas, Aśvakeśas.

(g) The countries and peoples situated in the left hind foot of the tortoise are the following :

The Māṇḍavyas, Caṇḍakhāras, Aśvakalantakas, Kunyatāladahas, Strivāhyas, Sālikas, Nṛ-simhas who dwell on the Veṇumatī, other people who dwell in Valāva, Dharma-baddhas, Alukas, and the people who occupy Urukarma.

(h) The following countries and peoples are placed on the Tortoise's left flank :

Krauñcas, Kurus, Vakas, Kṣudravīṇas, Rasālayas, Kaikeyas, Bhogaprasthas, Yāmunas, Antardvīpas, Trigarttas, Agñijjas, Sārḍana people, Aśvamukhas, Prāptas, long-haired Cīvidas Dāsarakas, Vātadhānas, Śavadhānas, Puṣkalas, Adhamakairātas, those who are settled in Takṣaśīlā, Ambālas, Mālavas, Madras, Veṇukas, Vadantikas, Piṅgalas, Māna-kalahas, Hūṇas, Kohalakas, Māṇḍavyas, Bhūti-yuvakas, Śātakas, Hema-tārakas, Yaśomatyas, Gāndhāras, Khara-sāgararāśīs, Yaudheyas, Dāsameyas, Rājanyas, Śyāmakas and Kṣemadhūrtas.

(i) The following countries and peoples are situated on the Tortoise's north-east foot :

Yenas, Kinnaras, the countries of Praśupāla, Kīcaka Kāśmīra, the people of Abhisāra, Davadas, Tvaṅganas, Kulatās, Vanarāṣṭrakas, Sairiṣṭhas, Brahmapūrakas, Vanā-vāhyakas, Kirātas, Kauśikas, Ānandas, Pahlavas, Lolanas, Dārvādas, Marakas, Kurutās, Anna-dārakas, Ekapādas, Khasas, Ghoṣas, Svarga-bhaumānavadyakas, Hīngas, Yavanas, Cīraprāvaras, Trinetras, Pauravas and the Gandharvas.

A FEW PARALLELS IN JAIN AND BUDDHIST WORKS

BY

A. M. Ghatage, M. A.

The two canons, of the Buddhists in Pāli and of the Jains in Ardha-Māgadhī, present us with a few interesting parallels worth consideration. The study of such parallels is interesting both for its own sake and for the light it throws on the problem of the relation in which these two religions stand with each other. The real explanation of the similarity found therein, whether it is a case of borrowing or one of common inheritance or even one of accidental coincidence, is to be decided in each particular case by considerations of its individual peculiarities. And as such their examination will help us in forming an idea about the exact relation in which these religions stand, particularly in their literary traditions.

Both the religions, Buddhism and Jainism, arose in the same country of Magadha and at about the same time. As such they partook of the same surroundings which goes a long way in determining many of their common features. But besides this general similarity of spirit and form which can be explained as due to the influence of the time-spirit we find something more to think of in the present case. The canons of both these religions show similarity not only in the general moral and disciplinary tone due mainly to the fact that they embody the same general principles of ethics which are common to both these religions which is in its turn due to the circumstance of their birth and early growth, but also in matters of composition and wording which requires something more to explain them. They raise the important question of borrowings and the authentic nature of one tradition as against the other and the question of their respective age.

Even though it is now admitted on all hands that Jainism as a religion arose a few decades earlier than Buddhism, or even

a few centuries before it, if we accept the view that not only Pārśva was a historical person but that the traditional date of his birth and death is equally trustworthy, a fact not beyond reasonable doubt; the question of the formation of the two canons of these two religions stands on a very different footing, and is in no way connected with it. It is yet very difficult to believe that the present Ardha-Māgadhi canon, which tradition itself admits to have suffered much recasting and reduction, and which has the still greater disadvantage of being repudiated by the whole of the Digambara community of the Jains, can be reasonably attributed to a period to which the Pāli canon of the Buddhist is attributed at the latest.¹ It is true that the Pāli tradition also shows us the Buddhist canon as going through the similar stages of redactions at various stages of its history, but their last council falls in the reign of king Aśoka in the third century B. C.² while the last council of the Jains comes in the fifth century A. D. in the days of the kings of Valabhi.³ So if we are to believe in these traditions alone it is clear that the Pāli canon will have to be put much earlier than the Ardha-Māgadhi one.

This problem of the relative priority of the two canons is further rendered more difficult and complicated by the supposition of an Ardha-Māgadhi canon earlier than the present one, and a similar canon of the Buddhist which again according to Lüders will have to be supposed to be written in old Ardha-Māgadhi.⁴ All such speculations have no doubt some indications in the present canons themselves and can on that account be said to rest on facts. In the case of the Jain canon we even possess an outline of the older canon preserved to us with more or less accuracy, while it will be very unwise to put down the whole of the Pāli canon at the time of Aśoka. But it is equally true that it is not possible now to separate them from their later

1 Keith, *Buddhist Philosophy in India and Ceylon*. Ch. i. pp. 15-24.

2 Op. Rhys Davids. *Buddhism its History and Literature*. pp. 187-195. Winternitz, *His. Ind. Lit.* Vol. II, pp. 4-5; Kern. *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 103ff.

3 Charpentier. Introduction to his edition of the *Uttarādhyaṇa*, pp. 15-16.

4 Brückhage *Buddhistischen Dramen. Einleitung*.

additions with anything like certainty. For the present purpose then of comparing a few parallel passages from the two canons it is better to set them aside and to start without the supposition of earlier works not to be found to day, even though the parallels themselves are adduced to prove their existence.

To begin with, we have a number of stories common to the two canons which we take for consideration. Of all the works of the Jain canon the Uttarādhyayana is the most important as it preserves many interesting stories and parables which are also to be met with in various works of the Buddhist. Here we meet the story¹ of the two persons called Citra and Sambhūta who were fast friends at the beginning and wandered a series of lives together but at the end suffered very different fates because of their characters. This story is also found in the Jātaka collections in the Citta-Sambhūta-Jātaka.² As pointed out by Dr. J. Charpentier the two chapters show similarity not only in the general outline of the story and its main incidents but even in the verses found in them which are common to both the books. The story in the Uttarādhyayana is in verses only while the one found in the Jātaka books is in mixed verse and prose as usual. This fact along with the fact that the Gāthās of the Jātaka are decidedly older than the prose which is very late as can be seen both on linguistic and logical grounds would lead us to suppose that the story as preserved in the Uttarādhyayana is the older of the two. But the Jain version says nothing of the earlier lives of these two friends which are however referred to in their conversation.³ The Jātaka gives us all the details about this earlier part of the story which cannot be regarded as a later modification of it or an addition to it. So also we have a few cases in which the order of the verses in the Jātaka books appears more in accord with the general trend of the story than the one found in the Jain version. This is to be explained on the supposition that the Jain version has suffered in its arrangement while the Jātaka books were more fortunate in having a commentary which numbered its verses very early and arranged them rigidly which has saved it from

¹ Ch. XIII, pp. 115-119.

² No. 498, Fausbøll, Vo. II, pp. 390-400.

³ Ch. XIII, Vs. 5-7.

any further change. On the other hand the Jain version also lost the earlier part of the story which is preserved to us in the prose of the Jātakas even though it is put down much later than the writing of the chapter in the Uttarādhyayana.

Another story common to these two works is that of Isukāra¹ in the Uttarādhyayana and the Hatthipārajātaka² in the Jātaka books. The story relates that a king and his preceptor had no son, but with the help of a tree-spirit the Purohita was able to obtain four sons who were all religious-minded. To test their zeal in the matters of religion and to know for certain whether they will live in the worldly life or not both the king and the Purohita approached them in the garbs of monks and found that all of them turned out monks. This led the wife of the Purohita and and himself to take up to asceticism and consequently the king and the queen also do the same thing. In this case it will be seen that the story of the Jātaka books is fuller and gives many details about the birth of the four sons of the Purohita which are wanting in the chapter of the Jain work. There the story begins abruptly with the statement that all the characters in the story were born in the same town descending from their heavenly abode. Another difference between the two versions is about the number of the sons the Purohita had, they are four in the Jātaka while only two in the Uttarādhyayana chapter. This fact again is made use of in the Jātaka books to give rise to four different occasions for the renouncing of this world by the four sons and taking to ascetic life, which is occasioned by seeing the king and the Purohita in the garbs of a monk, and the repetition of the same situation for four times. In the story as preserved in the Uttarādhyayana there appears to exist no relation between the Purohita and the king, while in the Jātaka they are represented as consulting each other and plotting together to test the sons of the Purohita as to their intention of becoming monk. In the version of the Jains it appears that when all the members of the family of the Purohita took to monkhood, the king came in the possession of their property according to the rule of the Dharmaśāstras. This occasioned a complete change in the mind of the queen who turns her mind to nunhood and also advises the king to the same

¹ Ch. XIV, pp. 119-125.

² No. 509, pp. 473-490. Vol. IV.

⁴ [*Annals*, B. O. R. I.]

effect. This fact appears to be more natural and appropriate than the one found in the Jātaka books. Considering further, facts like the story of the four sons acting exactly like each other, their long-drawn moralising, the improbable story of the spirit in the tree in the beginning which is pleased to give four sons to the Purohita alone and not a single one to the king who was in greater need of an heir, and the curious relation between the king and the Purohita, it is clear that the Jain version is not only earlier but is better preserved and the more interesting of the two.

The story of a low-caste man attaining to a high position and showing the ill-founded faith of the Brahmans in their idea of greatness in birth is found in the Hariṣiṃjam¹ of the Uttarādhyayana and the Mātanga-jātaka² of the Buddhists. The two stories shew a good deal of divergence in all matters except the central idea of the approach of the Cāṇḍāla to the feast of the Brahmans the wrong treatment given to him by the priest in one case and by his own son in the other, the sound beating they receive at the hands of the demi-gods who attend on the Mātanga, the approach of the woman the daughter of the king of Pāṇcāla in case of the Jain version and of a merchant in case of the Buddhist version, her revealing the greatness of the Mātanga, and the recovery of the Brahmans from the illness. And it is interesting to note that this part of the story is to be found in the verses which are common to both the versions to a great extent. The Jain version adds little to the body of the text but the commentator³ gives us the back-ground of the whole story. He relates how the daughter of the king of the country of Pāṇcāla went to a temple and saw there the Cāṇḍāla whom she abhorred. But a spirit possessed her and to get her out of its clutches the king became ready to give her to the same low-caste man. But the sage refused to marry as its being against his monkhood. Now once he goes to the sacrificial ground of the Purohita of the king where he is refused food. And there the story begins in the Uttarādhyayana. The story in the Jātaka is much more complicated and expanded. There also the daughter of a rich merchant

¹ Ch. XII, pp. 109-115.

² No. 497, Vol. IV, pp. 375-389.

³ Cp. the commentaries of Śāntyācārya and Devendra,

meets a Mātāṅga and feels disgusted at his sight. The man is beaten by her servants. But he goes to the house of the merchant and lies at the door until he is given the same daughter in marriage which is done at his persistence. A son is born to them, but in the mean time he becomes a sage and to confer prosperity on his wife makes the people believe that she is the wife of the great Brahmā. While the son grows old and is worshipped by all the people, the main incidents of the story happen. From this the Jātaka proceeds to give another story of the same Mātāṅga only because it also deals with the same theme. Otherwise it has no connection with the main story. A comparison of the two versions will make it clear that the Buddhist story is much more elaborate and of mixed motifs. The Jain version, on the other hand is much more simple and to the point. But there is one consideration which should lead us to think that the Jain version is the older of the two. On a careful reading of the Buddhist story it is seen that the attitude behind it is much more haughty and full of bitter feelings than the one which accentuated the writer of the Jain version. This can be seen in the facts like the plain deception of the Brahmans and the administration of the food as a cure for the beating. This must have also led the writer to include the other story in the same Jātaka. And such an attitude must have arisen in later times as the effect of sectarian bias. The original motive of writing such stories appears to be to show the hollow foundation of the greatness claimed by the Brahmans on account of birth alone. And this is clearly seen in the Jain version and in a much more humane and sympathetic form.

Another book of stories in the Jain canon is the sixth Aṅga called the Jñātādharmakathā. Here also we meet with a few parallels in the Buddhist works. The illustration of the tortoise¹ in it has a clear parallel in the Saṃyutta-Nikāya II² which by the nature of the case appears to be a very ancient simile developed into an illustration and used by both the religions for the specific purpose of moralising on the control of the senses. The story³ of the two brothers going on a voyage and suffering

¹ Ch. 4th.

² Cp. Oldenberg, Buddha, p. 313.

³ Jñātādharmakathā, Ch. 9th.

a good deal at the hands of the deity on the Ratnadvīpa who killed so many ship-wrecked people and the winged horse who helped them in flying from that island, and the fall of one of the two brothers because of the temptations of that Yakṣiṇī has a parallel in Valāhassa-Jātaka¹ where the part of the winged horse is played by the compassionate Bodhisatta.

Of greater importance is the story in the chapter of this book called the Amarakāṇḍa² which related the Jain version of the Brahmanic epic of the Kuru family considerably changed and modified to suit the Jain religion. In tracing the early life of Draupadī we find a very curious story of a girl called Sukumārā which has a very distinct parallel in the story of Isidāsī³ in the Therī-Gāthā. The story tells of a girl who sinned in giving bad food to a monk, and as a result of which she was born in her next birth with an unpleasant touch of her body. She was married to a son of a merchant but in the very next day of their marriage he ran off to avoid her unpleasant touch. She returned back to her father's house where her father married her a second time with a monk who had come to his house to beg food. He also ran off the next day and the girl disgusted at her life took to the life of a nun. The Buddhist story of the unhappy girl is materially the same. The form in which the story is found in the Jain version is fragmentary and incomplete and is relegated to the back-ground, showing great inferiority to the other version in the Therī-Gāthā which is more complete and better told. But against the natural supposition of regarding the Buddhist version as earlier on account of its artistic superiority we have many textual indications in the Pāli version itself which go to prove a very different result. As remarked by Mrs. Rhys Davids⁴ the whole spirit of the poem is non-Buddhistic and shows many traces of Jain tendency of valuing mortification and penance as more important. To add to this, we find such a technical term as Nirjarā⁵ used in the poem, and the

¹ No. 196, Cp. Winternitz, op. cit. p. 131.

² Jāt. Ch. 16th.

³ Ed. by Müller, Verses 400-447, pp. 260-271.

⁴ In the introduction of her Psalms of the Sisters, P. T. S. V. 431.

name of the teacher of the unhappy girl is given as Jinadatta¹ not without significance. So it is more than probable that the writer of the Pāli poem had before him some Jain version of the story even though it may not be identical with the very meagre survival of it in the sixth Aṅga of the *Ardha-Māgadhi* canon. The Pāli tradition itself admits that the present poem in the *Therī-Gāthā* is much later than the bulk of the work and was introduced into the collection by the *Samgītikāras*.

Two other stories in the *Jāntādharmakathā* have parallels in the anecdotes told by Buddhagosa in his *Visuddhi-Magga*. Considering the nature of his work and his usual method of relating stories from earlier literature we can fairly suppose that the present two stories are also drawn by him from the canon or possibly from the older *Atthakathās* in Ceylon. This is more probable as he omits all details and satisfies himself with a bare reference which shows that the stories were very famous and already known to his readers. The story² of the merchant becoming a frog because of his falling away from the right path to which he was first introduced and his consequent liberation is told in the *Visuddhi-Magga* without the previous life of the merchant, while the cause of his death is different in the two versions. In the Jain version³ the frog is trampled down by the hoof of Śrenika's horse, while in the Buddhist story a cowherd kills the frog with a stick. The second parallel⁴ is not so marked as Buddhagosa only gives a passing remark about the central idea of the story without adding details. But the idea and the statement is so queer and out of the way that we are forced to think that there must be a story behind it. The Jain work⁵ relates the story in full. It tells us that a merchant was pursuing a thief who had carried away his daughter. But before he was able to catch hold of him the thief killed the girl and escaped. Now the father and his sons who were pursuing him found themselves in a thick forest without food. So to save themselves they ate

¹ V. 427.

² Ed. Mrs. Rhys Davids, P. T. S. Vol. I, p. 208.

³ *Jñāt.* Ch. 13th.

⁴ *Visuddhi-Magga*. Vol. I, p. 347.

⁵ *Jñāt.* Ch. 18th.

the flesh of the girl and in this manner came safe to their own town. Buddhagosa makes the father to eat the flesh of the son instead of the daughter.

Besides these parallels in story and fable, we find similarities in the two canons about some important philosophical discussions. The most important among them is dialogue in the *Rayapaseṇīyam*¹ and the *Pāyāsi Suttanta*² in the *Digha-Nikaya*. Similarities in wording and similes and expressions leave no doubt as regards their mutual relation. Either both must have followed very closely a common source or one must have made a considerable use of the other. The Jain version as found in the second *Upāṅga* forms the central theme of the work. It turns on the point of the existence of the soul independent of the body in which it is embodied. Kesi the follower of Lord Pārśva tries to prove the soul as existing and refutes the arguments of king Paēsi who is a follower of the heretical teacher Ajita Kesakambali. The Pāli version makes the king bear the name Pāyāsi who holds conversation with Kumāra Kassapa who is also shown triumphant in refuting the arguments of the king. Some scholars are inclined to think that the Jain version is the later of the two, but without sufficient reasons³. On the contrary there are a few facts which point unmistakably to the conclusion that the Jain version is the older of the two. The vehement denial of the soul which is the main function of this story is a little inconsistent with the general spirit of Buddhism. Herein Buddhism agrees more with the views of the king than his opponent who is shown as successful in both the versions. According to the Buddhist tradition itself the present Sutta is not of equal age with the others of the same collection. It is even admitted that the real name of the king was Paēsi and not Pāyāsi which is an unmistakable sign of the authentic nature of the Jain tradition as against the Buddhist version. On the other hand the Jain version is shown to be contemporaneous with Mahāvira as Kesi the disciple of Pārśva is shown in other works⁴ to hold conversation with

¹ Ed. by Dr. Valdiya, Poona, 1934.

² Ed. P. T. S. No. 23, Vol. II, pp. 316-358.

³ Cp. B. C. Law. *A History of Pāli Literature*, 1933. Vol. I, p. 109.

⁴ Cp. Uttar. Ch. 23rd.

Gotama the chief disciple of Lord Mahāvira. So here also we will have to admit that the Jain version of the dialogue is of better authenticity and we can go so far as to assert that it was the Jains who first tried to refute this doctrine of Ajita as being the exact contradictory position of their own theory of the existence of the soul. The Buddhist took this refutation bodily from them even though a little inconsistent with their own vehement denial of a soul.

Another philosophical discussion common to the two literatures is that about the refutation of the philosophy of Gosāla. In the Jain works we find it stated in the *Upāsagadasāo*¹ and the *Bhagavati*² while in the *Sāmaññaphalasutta*³ of the *Dīgha-Nikāya* is found a summary of his views. The life story of Gosāla as found in the *Bhagavati Sūtra* is not to be met with in the Buddhist works. But the statement of his doctrines is common to both of them in a very similar phraseology. It is just possible that both of them were copying from the works of that sect. But the other alternative is more probable. It can very easily be seen that Gosāla was more intimately connected with Jainism than with Buddhism, even though it is very difficult to decide the exact relation in which he stood. But in view of the fact that his doctrines are taken by him from the *Pūrvas* and his claim to be the last prophet of Jainism it appears that he represented another line of the school of *Pārśva* while Mahāvira succeeded in asserting himself as the true continuer of the orthodox line. So it is more probable that the Jain version had better chances of giving the views of the school of Gosāla in a more authentic form than its rival religion Buddhism.

Apart from these similarities extending over a long incident we have a good many verses⁴ in common in the works of

¹ Ed. by Dr. Vaidya, Poona, 1930. Chs. 6 and 7.

² *Uvās* pp. 139-192.

³ Ed. P. T. S. Vol. I, pp. 47-86.

⁴ I give below the common verses from *Uttarādhyaṇa* and *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* as far as I am able to detect. *Uttā.* I, 17. *Therī-Gāthā.* 247; II, 3. *Theragā.* 243; II, 24-25. *Suttanipāṭa.* 932; III, 17. *Sn.* 769; IV, I. *Dhp.* 182; IV, 3. *Theragā.* 786; V, 21. *Dhp.* 141; VI, 13. *Sn.* 927; IX, 34. *Dhp.* 103; 44. *Dhp.* 70; 48-49. *Māra-Saṅg.* 11, 10, 6; X, 28. *Dhp.* 285; XXV, 16. *Sn.* 268;

these two religions. Particularly the Uttarādhyayana and the Sūtrakṛtāṅga show many verses in common with the various books of the Pāli canon like the Dhammapada the Thera and Therī-Gāthās the Suttanipāta and stray verses from the Nikāyas. Dr. Winternitz¹ has suggested the solution of such similar verses in the supposition that there existed before both these canons a floating mass of poetry dealing with ascetic life and ideals which was incorporated in the works of both these religions.

17. Sn. 136; 31. Dhp. 264; XXVII, 8. Thera-Gā. 976. Sūtrak. I, 1, 1, 3. Sn. 394; I, 2, 1, 2. Sn. 578; I, 2, 1, 15. Saṃyutta-Nikāya. IX, 1; I, 2, 2, 11. Thera-Ga. 1053; I, 2, 2, 15. Dhp. 378; I, 2, 2, 17. Sn. 810; I, 3, 2, 21. Thera-Ga. 1154; I, 3, 4, 7. Therī-Ga. 508; I, 3, 4, 8. Dhp. 245; I, 5, 8, Dhp. 307; I, 7, 15-16. Therī-Ga. 241-244; I, 7, 25. Dhp. 325; I, 8, 7. Dhp. 5; I, 8, 19. Sn. 400; etc.

¹ Hist. Ind. Lit. Vol. II, P. 121, p. 125 etc.

THE METAMORPHOSIS OF UṢAS

BY

K. M. Shembavnekar, M. A.

The disappearance of Uṣas from the Vedic pantheon is as mysterious as her presence interesting. It is all the more inexplicable as we remember the amount of poetic wealth spent on the enchanting Daughter of Heaven by the Vedic Rsis who handle the theme of her rise and duration with a reverence and love that belong only to the earliest poets, or rather prophets, of mankind. But though the final exit of the charming goddess is generally regretted, its cause is, as yet, scarcely properly investigated. The universal law of Change, it is true, is the general answer to the too inquisitive questioner in all matters relating to antiquity, but still a momentous change is always worthy of our investigation. For the loss of an old order or thing, if viewed in the scientific perspective, is brought about in two ways: either by metamorphosis, in which the old disappears only to emerge as new; or by supersession, in which the old is pushed aside by a stronger new rival. The object of the present article is to prove that Uṣas has changed in the former sense, though the evolution is not even so much as suspected, first, because of the dimness of the intermediate stages, and secondly by reason of the great development in her new character. When, however, the progressive stages which transformed the Vedic Uṣas into Lakṣmī of later mythology become luminous, it will be easily conceded that Theology also presents instances of metamorphosis as strange or remarkable as Zoology, and as attractive as any that either Ovid or Dante depicts in poetry.

It never seems to have struck any writer on Indian mythology that though the goddess Śrī (the goddess of splendour and wealth) is the same as Lakṣmī according to all later accounts, yet in her earlier phase she possesses certain attributes which clearly argue a period of transition. Some of them disclose her identity with Uṣas, while others are of a novel type. This is, of course, the intermediate stage wherein the old traits appear oddly blended with the

new, quite in conformity with the change of time. For the period which marked the close of the R̥gvedic epoch was a period of transition in many respects. The old gods, severing their connection with the phenomena of Nature, were assuming a more and more anthropomorphic shape, and also a more exalted character as becomes the epic gods. The R̥gvedic words, at first so strikingly cognate to the root-meaning in their import, now become gradually settled in their conventional senses. And the school of the 'Aitiḥāsikas'—the gleaners of old legends and myths—was busy weaving them into wondrous poetic tales. But in spite of this general change in theology, Indra, Varuṇa and the other gods have not lost their old appellations which are the most unmistakable signs of recognition. Such is not, however, the case with Uṣas. The Dawn, the natural phenomenon, slowly lost her divinity, but her radiance which is the very essence of her life and form came to be deified and venerated as Śrī. Why this latter goddess is not even mentioned in the *R̥gveda*, it is now easy to understand. It is in the famous 'Śrī-Sūkta', which is a 'Khila Sūkta' of that Veda, and undoubtedly the oldest of that class, that we see her for the first time. In this early conception of the new deity we perceive a good many attributes that usually characterise the *lustre* of the dawn. And *that* settles the question of identity notwithstanding the metonymic change. Thus, if the rays of Uṣas are said to be 'Candra' (delightful) in the R.V.,¹ Śrī herself is described as 'Candrā' in the *Śrī-Sūkta*.² Both are golden in complexion, and both shower the same gifts on the suppliant devotees, namely, cows, chariots, horses, heroic sons etc.³ The epithet 'Piṅgalā' (the Rosy) as applied to Śrī in the *Sūkta*, is intelligible only when we view her in the light of this identification. Similarly, why Śrī or Lakṣmī is described as clad in milk-white⁴ garments, and fond of white flowers and decoration, will be clear if we remember that the original Vedic goddess is said to be

¹ Cf. उष आ माहि भानुना चन्द्रेण द्रुहितर्दिवः । R. V. I. 48-9

² चन्द्रां हिरण्मयीं लक्ष्मीं जातवेदो ममावह । Śrī-Sūkta 1

³ Compare R. V. I. 48, 12-16; also VII, 75, 8 with यस्यां हिरण्यं विन्देयं गामस्यं पुरुषानहम् । Śrī Sūkta

⁴ Cf. सरसिजनिलये सरोजहस्ते धवलतराशुकगन्धमाल्यशोभे ।

'Śubhrā' ¹ or 'Arjuni' (the white), and also as 'dressed in resplendent white'. Still more important is the epithet 'Ārdrā' (the wet) belonging to Śrī, since it is only a paraphrase of Uṣas' corresponding epithet 'Odatī' ² (the moist). It is necessary to remark in this connection that in later times Lakṣmī has not retained any such clear mark of wetness after she landed on the dry ground leaving her watery home. Next, the fact that 'Jātavedas' or Agni is implored in the *Śrī-Sūkta* to bring in Lakṣmī, furnishes the most unequivocal clue to regard Śrī as identical with Uṣas. For the close relation of the two divinities in the *Rgveda* is a patent fact, while in the *Sūkta* it is only a sort of reminiscence. ³ Again, the sisterhood between 'A-Lakṣmī' (Poverty, Distress), and Lakṣmī may fairly be traced back to the times when the dark night was sincerely looked upon as the elder sister of the bright Dawn. ⁴ Lastly, the epithet 'gandha-dvārā' (unfolders of fragrance), as belonging to Śrī suggests the aromatic dawn, while her association with the day-lotuses (padmas) which bloom at day-break confirms it.

All this is again highly corroborated by the history of the evolution, which, when properly traced, is as interesting as the result, and makes certain moot points in the life of the Vedic goddess very luminous. It is expressly stated in the *Viṣṇu* and other *Purāṇas* that the churning of the Ocean was occasioned by the disappearance of Śrī into it owing to the curse of Durvāsas, and that she was known to be the daughter of Bhṛgu in her previous existence. Now, who is Bhṛgu? The Bhṛgus, indeed, figure in the *Rgveda* as a clan of mighty Ṛṣis, like the Āṅgirasas and the Atharvans, but none of them individually receives the distinction of special mention. It is only in the *Taittirīya-Upaniṣad*

¹ उषः शुक्लेण शोचिषा । R. V. I. 48, 14; रुशद्वासो विभ्रती शुक्रमश्वैः । VII. 77, 2. व्युच्छन्ती युवतिः शुक्रवासाः । I. 113, 7

² आर्द्रा पुष्करिणी etc. Śrī-Sūkta

पदं न वेत्योदती । R. V. I. 48-6.

³ तां म आवह जातवेदो लक्ष्मिन्पगामिनीम् । Śrī S. Cf. R. V. 1. 124. 1

⁴ श्यावी च यदरुणी च स्वसारौ R. V. III; 55, 11 स्वसा स्वस्त्रे ज्यायस्ये योनिमारैक ।

I. 124, 1

that we meet with a mythological personality of that name for the first time. But then, it should be observed, he is there said to be the son of Varuṇa¹ and none of the members of the R̥ṣi-clan. When we remember that 'Bhṛgu', even in Classical Sanskrit, means a 'precipice', the mystery surrounding the mythical being is at once unravelled. He is either the rising mountain, or the 'Lokāloka'—the chain of mountain that seems to encircle the earth. Viewed in this light, his paternal relation to Varuṇa (the Lord of the sky) becomes manifest. Again, Venus, the planet, is also called Bhṛgu's son (Bhārgava), as we may now believe, because of his keeping close to the horizon throughout. Thus proximity or close succession was sufficient for the Vedic or post-Vedic poets to establish some kind of family connection between a pair of natural objects or phenomena. Śrī, the daughter of Bhṛgu² (Bhārgavi) and the sister of the Morning star, can, therefore, be none other than Uṣas who invariably clings to the rising mountain, like a young maiden to her father's side.

How she disappeared into the ocean has been already referred to above. But the legend preserved in the *Viṣṇu* and some other *Purāṇas* seems to be the poetic version of an old Uṣas myth which may be traced in the *R̥gveda*. The reader of Uṣas hymns is startled, indeed, when he sees the mighty god Indra chastising the terrified celestial maiden—smashing her car in splinters, and chasing her to a great distance through the aerial space.³ And yet, the enormity of the crime for which she is so mercilessly dealt with is scarcely proclaimed. We are simply told that the offending goddess was a 'durhanāyu' i. e. 'a goer on the wrong track' (if 'han' means to 'go' according to the Grammarians' maxim वे हन्वर्थस्ते गत्वर्थः); or, 'desirous of killing Indra' (if 'han' means to 'kill'). All Vedic scholars, so far as I know, have been at a loss to understand the exact motive or magnitude of Uṣas' guilt. Even the great scholiast, Sāyaṇa, contents himself only with the paraphrase of the words, where we want an explanation of the myth. Now as a natural phenomenon this is intelli-

¹ Tait. U. III. 2.

² भृगोः ख्यात्यां सनुपन्ना श्रीः पूर्वमुद्धेः पुनः ।

देवदानवयत्नेन प्रसृताऽमृतमन्थने ॥ V. P. I. 9, 38.

³ R. V. IV. 20, 8-11

gible enough: Indra, the sun-god viewed as the dispeller of clouds and darkness, scares away the mild Uṣas by his superior effulgence. Her crime is, probably, nothing more than lingering a little longer even after sunrise on a cloudy day. But however we may explain the phenomenon, its mythological importance can never be overrated. For this is the very myth which is referred to, though in a slightly altered form, in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and which later on developed into the grand purāṇic legend of the Churning of the Ocean. The reference in the *Rāmāyaṇa* is clearly to the earlier version of the exploit of the Vedic war-god against the gentle Uṣas. When young Rāma, in obedience to the dictates of conscience and the universal law of chivalry, hesitated to kill the wicked Tāḍakā at the bidding of Viśvāmitra, the latter justifies the killing of a woman, provided it is beneficial to mankind; and as an instance he cites god Viṣṇu's killing Bhṛgu's wife, who thought of ridding the world of Indra.¹ Here we find Viṣṇu, the guardian of the world, taking the place of Indra and shielding him from all intrigues and mishaps, while the intriguer is the wife of Bhṛgu. Thus it is evident that Vālmiki had the legend from some older source—perhaps an old Brāhmaṇa or gāthā now lost—or, perhaps, from some other source than that of the Purāṇas, wherein Uṣas figured as the wife of Bhṛgu instead of his daughter. But the difference is trivial when we remember that the change in the import of the word 'patni' which, in early Vedic times meant simply a 'protectress' or 'governess' is of subsequent date, and that a corresponding change in mythological outlook was but a foregone conclusion. The legend in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, therefore, proves, first, that the wife of Bhṛgu is none other than Uṣas; and, secondly, that, notwithstanding certain minor differences, the various versions about the disappearance of that goddess are based on the same Vedic myth.

And lastly, we behold her once more, rising from the Ocean when it was churned by the gods and demons. The episode of the 'Churning of the Ocean' is not only the oldest legend in the epics and the Purāṇas, but also the grandest and boldest that could be conceived by a poet's fancy. The *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* unquestionably presents the older version of the story when it says that the divine

¹ विष्णुनापि पुनराम भृगुपत्नीं दृढव्रता ।

अनिन्दं लोकमिच्छन्ती काव्यमाता निबुद्धिता ॥ Rām. I. 25, 22

enterprise was for the recovery of the lost Śrī. The epics, on the other hand, unanimously declare that the chief aim of the gods and demons in that undertaking – perilous even for *them*—was the acquisition of the Immortal Drink (Amṛta). And though they describe the appearance of Śrī or Lakṣmī in glowing words, they do not connect the event with anything like her past history. According to the Puranic account, the reappearance of Śrī is an event of far greater moment for the gods than the gain of the ‘Amṛta’ as their hearty reception of the goddess followed by an outburst of spontaneous hymn clearly testifies. But this reincarnation of the goddess, and, indeed the whole story of the churning of the Ocean becomes intelligible enough, when we remember that the grand conception underlying it originated with the change in the import of the word ‘Samudra’ at the close of the Vedic period, and that the post-Vedic poet or poets were capable of preserving the old myths by giving them a new lease of life. It is clear to anyone tolerably acquainted with the *R̥gveda* that the word ‘Samudra’ denotes there the mid-air-region¹ (antarikṣa) as well as the terrestrial sea. However, in course of time, like many other *R̥gvedic* words, it became restricted in its import, and stood for one object only. If, therefore, the daughter of Bhṛgu, who, as we have already seen, is none other than Uṣas, vanishes into, and emerges again from, the ‘Samudra’, it is a change in the theological outlook rather than in the natural phenomenon—a change in the import of word and not in fact. It is not necessary for our purpose to trace here the previous history of the other ‘gems’, though, on a closer examination, that also may be found, at least in part, to conform to the same mode of explanation as above.² The whole episode of ‘Samudra-Man-

¹ Compare, for instance, एकः सुपर्णः स समुद्रमाविवेश etc. R. V. X, 114, 4 also X, 123, 2; where Sāyana remarks समुद्रं वत्सनादायः इति समुद्रोऽन्तरिक्षम् ।

² Thus it is clear why the moon is reckoned among the fourteen ‘gems’, if only we remember the change in the meaning of the word ‘Samudra’. And the desire-yielding cows (गावः कामदुघाः) who rose up from the ocean at the same time can be no other than the मातृयमिका वाक् whose abode is ‘antarikṣa’, and who manifests herself in the sweet and pure utterances of the wise. That sweet words serve the purpose of man in the highest degree was admitted in early Vedic times and hence ‘speech’, was said to be a bounteous cow; Compare. धेनुर्वागस्मानुपसृष्टुतैतु । Again, *Airāvata*, Indra’s elephant, is none other than the white cloud that floats in the *Antarikṣa*. Cf. प्रावृषेण्यं पयोवाहं विचरैरावतावत् । Raghu I. 36.

thana' is, indeed, a legend which proves that while Brahmanic ritualism was fast developing in the post-Vedic period, the Brahmanic Muse also was keeping pace along with it. And our only misfortune is that the names of those gifted sons of the Muse who left a rich and considerable heritage to the authors of the Epic and the present *Purāṇas* should have been so easily consigned to oblivion.

And, lastly, Lakṣmī's union with Viṣṇu amply bears out her Vedic origin and character as traced above by us. That Viṣṇu is the sun at the meridian is a conclusion of Yāska who identifies all the Ādityas with the solar deity. When, therefore, we behold the goddess taking refuge with Viṣṇu, the most high and popular of later mythology, we but realise what is anticipated in the *R̥gveda*, where the morning sun is described as chasing Uṣas—the rosy dawn—like a man who pursues a youthful maiden. As the worthy consort of the chief of the Hindu Trinity, Lakṣmī has equally risen in dignity and divinity, and now exercises a far greater influence on modern Hindu society than she did in the times of the Vedic R̥ṣis. For there are few high-class Hindu house-holds now-a-days where at least one female—wife or daughter—is not christened with one of her names. Immortal Dawn, in the words of a Vedic poet, disappears only to rise again.

SAMARĀṄGAṆASŪTRADHĀRA AND
YUKTIKALPATARU.

Whether these works are productions of one and the same
king Bhoja of Dhārā Nagari.

BY

P. A. Mankad

(N. B. समराङ्गण° and युक्ति° are abbreviations for समराङ्गणसूत्रधार and युक्तिकल्पतरु.)

1 In the foreword to युक्तिकल्पतरु, Mr. Narendranath Law writes—“ The evidence brought together by the learned Editor (Pandita Īshvara Chandra Sastri) in the preface, points to the 11th. century A. D. as the probable and generally accepted time of its composition, and to its reputed author, King Bhoja, to be no other than the Bhoja Parmāra of Dhārā ”. Mahāmahopādhyāya Gaṇapati Sastri, in his preface to समराङ्गणसूत्रधार Part I, says that the author of the work as mentioned in it is Mahārājādhirāja Śrī Bhoja Deva who is probably the same Bhoja of Dhārā who ruled over Malwa in the 1st part of the 11th century, A. D. and to whom many important works are ascribed, such as शृङ्गारप्रकाशक, सरस्वतीकण्ठाभरण etc.

In the preface of the same work, Part II, he says “ The Subject matter being शिल्प, the work need not possess the characteristics of a literary work. Nevertheless, it is remarkable for its sweet and simple Kāvya style. It is for this reason, that I said in the 1st volume that the author of the work is the same King Bhoja of Dhārā who wrote शृङ्गारप्रकाशक and other works, and to whom is ascribed a high place in the domain of साहित्य. ”

2 It would, thus, appear that both the editors are unanimous as regards the fixing of authorship on one and the same individual, viz. King Bhoja of Dhārā Nagari. The former adduces exhaustive evidence from extraneous materials, while the latter is content only with the solitary internal factor—sweet and simple kāvya style, and colophons, besides, perhaps.

3 Now, युक्ति° is composed by भोजराज, while समराङ्गण° is the product of महाराजाधिराजभोजदेव. युक्ति° has references, in the body of the work to भोज and भोजदेव, as is clear from various extracts interspersed in the book itself. This very fact shows that some other भोज and भोजदेव were authors of works treating of subjects dealt with in युक्ति°. (It may be pointed out, by the bye, that none of the extracts of भोज and भोजदेव in युक्ति° has been found in समराङ्गण°.) Further, one comes across a writer by name भोजराज vide Pages 78, 178, 199 of the 3rd part (क्रियापाद) of ईशानशिवगुरुदेव-पद्धात, of the Travancore Sanskrit Series ; Dr. Rajendralal Mitter, moreover, in his " Antiquities of Orissa " mentions as many as a dozen or more Bhojas who have flourished from the Vedic times downwards to the 12th century A. D. The majority of them, if not all, were reported to be not only patrons of literature, but to be, themselves, endowed with literary abilities of a very high order. This problem of authorship, when viewed from the point of so many Bhojas assumes a complicated aspect.

4. Unless the learned editors have been in possession of materials to definitely lead them to the conclusion that the same King Bhoja was the author of the works, I venture to hold that mere mention of the name Bhoja or of works युक्ति° and समराङ्गण°, in works of other writers, could not be the conclusive warrant for the statement advanced by the editors. I regret, I am not in possession of the reasons which have prompted them to reach the conclusions they have arrived at. I, for my part, have tried to study comparatively the works under reference from the internal evidence alone and have mainly confined myself to the position which bears on वास्तु and शिल्प more than anything else.

5 a To start with, let the *benedictory stanzas* speak for themselves—

कंसानन्दमकुर्वाणः कंसानन्दं करोति यः

तं देववृन्दैराराध्यमनाराध्यमहं भजे ॥ २ ॥ in युक्ति° and
देवः स पातु भुवनत्रयसूत्रधारस्त्वां बालचन्द्र कलिकाङ्कितजूटकोटिः etc.
in समराङ्गण°.

These, by themselves, tend, though to a very slight degree, to justify the position I have undertaken to emphasize, in as

much as the author in the one (युक्ति°) distinctly displays a leaning towards रुष्ण (विष्णु) while that in the other (समराङ्गण°) towards शिव.

b *Colophons*--युक्ति° has, at the end of every युक्ति, "इति भोजराज्ये युक्तिकल्पतरो नगरी युक्तिः", and, at the close of the book, the colophon runs as "इति श्रीमहाराजभोजराजविरचितो युक्तिकल्पतरुः समाप्तः". The colophon in समराङ्गण° at the end of every अध्याय runs as "इति श्रीमहाराजाधिराजश्रीभोजदेवविरचिते समराङ्गण° etc." These colophons, too, are suggestive. The author of युक्ति° is only a महाराजभोजराज, while that of समराङ्गण° is a personality with higher attributes, महाराजाधिराजभोजदेव. If these colophons, were really meant to signify what they actually connote, the only feasible inference would be that भोजराज when merely a महाराजा composed युक्ति° while समराङ्गण° came to be composed later on, in the height of his glory, when he had become महाराजाधिराजभोजदेव. In these days, we are quite familiar with instances of assumption of successive appellations such as महाराज, महाराजाधिराज, राजर्षि, देवर्षि, देव etc. by individuals in their different stages of life and thus महाराजभोजराज and महाराजाधिराजभोजदेव, may, for aught one can say, apply to one and the same person, as one advances in material and intellectual prosperity; and on this very account, I will dismiss these colophons, too. The author of युक्ति° makes a direct mention of the names, both of himself and his work (the benedictory verses on the 1st page are closely followed by a verse तनुते भोजनृपतिर्युक्तिकल्पतरं मुदे), while the author of समराङ्गण° is very modest in as much as he remains quite silent in this respect.

c The treatment of subjects in समराङ्गण° follows the Pauranik method, in as much as the subject matter is dealt with in the form of a dialogue between विश्वकर्मन् (the first and foremost exponent of Architecture, especially of the नागर school) and his disciples. The manner of treatment in युक्ति° is not so.

d Further, युक्ति° and समराङ्गण°, both, have ऋश् रत्न generally; only the closing verses which sum up the contents, of every अध्याय in the latter are mostly composed of समवृत्त of more than 8 syllables in a पाद while युक्ति° on the contrary, is interspersed in the body of युक्तis throughout, with longer verses.

Vide Pages	Verses
47	328
50	348
63	454
78	91
80	4
82	20 to 22
87	61 to 67
90	90 to 93
91	101
etc.	etc.

6. The benedictory stanzas, colophons, mention or absence of names of authors and works, after the opening verses, as also the justification or otherwise of the names assigned to the works—these, in combination, if not singly, may assist one in the work of differentiation of authorship to a certain extent, though not so much as the substantial internal evidence which follows and which, I presume, will lead one to the irresistible conclusion as regards the non-identity of authorship of these two works. For a positive assertion that the one or the other was the King Bhoja of धारानगरी, internal evidence is totally wanting in both. All the same, there is no doubt that समराङ्गण° is the product of the King Bhoja of धारानगरी.

7 Writings of authors belonging to any department of knowledge are generally characterized by their individual or personal stamp. Turn to any domain of knowledge, say Poetry, Literature, Science etc. and one is sure to be impressed by this personal stamp. This is, moreover, prominently brought out in works, especially when they have emanated from one and the same author. Plays of Shakespeare, novels of Walter Scott, writings of Kālidāsa etc. will bear out, on comparative study, the above statement in a marked manner. Such a characteristic feature is manifested in a variety of ways—common words and set phrases, similarity of ideas, the diction etc. It is only when one fails to recognize any of these common traits of language and ideas, in works which are ordinarily ascribed to the same author, that one has, perforce, to set about thinking as to the real authorship of these works. When the above test is applied to समराङ्गण°

and युक्ति°, the conclusions are in favour of the contention that these productions cannot be of one and the same individual—King Bhoja of Dhārā.

α Single words.—युक्ति° displays an unusual though distinct terminology of technical words which has no place in समराङ्गण°. I append them in parallel columns for easy verification.

युक्त°		समराङ्गण
दुर्ग (a fortress)	Not to be found, but दुर्ग is used instead.	
प्राचीर (an enclosure)	ditto	प्राकार
प्रस्थ (broad)	"	विस्तृत
प्रसर (breadth)	"	विस्तार
आघात (an objectionable combination)	"	वेध
वाटी (a plan)	"	वास्तु
खट्वा (a bedstead)	"	शय्या
ग्रहपथान (a head piece of of a bedstead)	"	ईशा
निरूपक (a foot piece of a bedstead)	"	उत्पल
आलिङ्गन (a side piece of a bedstead)	"	
चरण	"	पाद
प्रकोष्ठ (a room near the gate of a palace)	"	
राजपात्र	"	
राजपीठ (V. 410)	"	
राजहस्त	"	
राजदण्ड	"	
राजकाण्ड	} Measures of length	"
राजशुरुष		"
राजछत्र		"
राजप्रधानी		"
राजक्षेत्र		"
Names of 16 kinds of नगरी	"	
Names of 8 kinds of वास्तु	"	
Names of 18 kinds of वाटी	"	
a kind of ग्रहपथक (मङ्गल, कमलक, सर्वतोभद्र, कल्याण and छत्रक)	"	

युक्ति°

समराङ्गण°

Names of 12 kinds of राजगृह	Not to be found
राजद्वार, अपद्वार, यमद्वार	"
भृङ्गार	"
चषक	"
फालम्बा	"
etc.	etc.

While the above words are profusely used in युक्ति°, most of them, if not all, are conspicuous by their total absence in समराङ्गण°. Moreover, one whole chapter is devoted, in the latter, to an exposition of definitions of technical words and yet it is surprising to note that the definitions of प्राचीर, राजहस्त, राजद्वार, राजदण्ड, राजकाण्ड, राजपुरुष, राजप्रधानी, राजक्षेत्र, राजद्वार, अपद्वार, यमद्वार, पिण्ड, व्युपधान, निरूपक, आलिङ्गन, उपकरण, भृङ्गार, चषक, राजपात्र, राजपीठ, यान, (चतुष्पद, द्विपद, त्रिपद, बहुपाद, विमान), आसन (86. 87-88), छत्र (447) तन्त्रु, सूत्र, गुण, पाश, रश्मि, रज्जु (450-451) कौषेय P. 81 V. 19 etc. etc. which are given in युक्ति° are absolutely wanting therein. युक्ति° has पदाघात, पथाघात etc. whereas समराङ्गण° has द्वारवेध, मागवध etc. Similarly महादुर्ग, पङ्कदुर्ग, पार्वतीयदुर्ग, वनदुर्ग, अद्दुर्ग of the latter are replaced by जलद्वन्द्व, पर्वतद्वन्द्व, नदीद्वन्द्व, वनद्वन्द्व, धनुर्द्वन्द्व, मनुष्यद्वन्द्व etc. in युक्ति°.

b Set phrases.— To illustrate, the expressions which are very current in युक्ति° are rarely met with in समराङ्गण°; I append parallel phrases— the most common combination for length and breadth.

युक्ति° has	while समराङ्गण° has
आयाम-परिणाह	आयाम-विस्तार
दैर्घ्य-प्रसर	दैर्घ्य-पृथुत्व
दीर्घ-प्रस्थ	आयाम-पृथुत्व

Turn to any description where length and breadth are concerned and you will find that युक्ति° will invariably show आयाम-परिणाह, while for the same meaning, समराङ्गण° has different expressions.

युक्ति° has hardly 350 verses bearing on गती and वास्तु in comparison with समराङ्गण° which is several times bigger than युक्ति° in this respect, and yet, even in that small compass, the ordinary combination for length and breadth—आयाम-परिणाह occurs as many as 14 times. दैर्घ्य-प्रसर and दीर्घ-प्रस्थ as many as 12 times and आयाम-प्रसर twice in युक्ति°, whereas the same combination

आयाम-परिणाह scarcely finds a place in समराङ्गण°; परिणाह is used only 3 times and that, too, in a sense rather different from the one pointed out above, while प्रस्तर and प्रस्थ are never used in such a combination at all, in समराङ्गण°.

c. *Similarity or otherwise of ideas.*—समराङ्गण° treats of वास्तु for the ordinary run of the populace as well as for higher personages, culminating in the residential seats etc. for divinities. It includes principles of design and many cognate subjects at great length. It is as exhaustive in the treatment of the subject matter वास्तु in its various aspects, as it is logical in its method of handling it. As such, it deserves rightly to be styled a standard work in the नागर school of Indian Architecture. युक्ति° in comparison with the above, is merely a specialized epitome of a certain section of वास्तु. It, all the same, covers an extra ground in that it includes in its treatment, all the paraphernalia of royalty, such as the appendages of a King (दण्ड, चामर, अभ्युपात्र, etc. सिंहासन, छत्र), his ornaments (various kinds of रत्न) शस्त्र, अस्त्र, horses, elephants, bulls, animals of draught and conveyances, ships etc. etc. युक्ति° is thus, restricted in its treatment of the principles of वास्तु; and yet, withal, it is, as its name implies, really a कल्पतरु so far as its युक्तis go. Each page bristles with some unusual or original conception, not commonly met with in समराङ्गण° an exhaustive and all embracing work on वास्तु.

I append hereunder a number of these ideas—

c 1 Various are the considerations that go to guide the selection of a site for buildings, townships etc.; one of them is प्लव, declination or “lie of the ground site”. This प्लव, it may be stated, may be in one direction, or it may be concurrent in two or more directions. The form which the consideration of this problem assumes, becomes the more complex, the more directions are involved in it. One generalization, however, emerges from these considerations re. प्लव and it is—that a direction ranging anywhere between North and East is acceptable for the selection of a site for buildings. समराङ्गण° equally with many other works on वास्तु mentions this aspect of प्लव in a more or less detailed manner. The only correspondence that has been established in that work has reference to the slope of the site, and the direction

in general (without any reference to an extra element) in which it runs. युक्ति°, on the other hand, introduces a third and unique element in this consideration. This third element is जन्मलक्षणदिक् over and above the slope and general direction of run of the site. The introduction of this extra element is a deviation from the general rule so far as वास्तु of राजगृह is concerned. All the same, the absence of this phase of प्लव in an exhaustive treatise like समराङ्गण°, wherein, by the bye, two exclusive chapters dealing with Royal Palaces, over and above general specifications scattered in several chapters in the body of the book have been introduced, cannot but be striking and thought provoking.

c 2 Books on वास्तु in their earlier portions begin with a description of units of measurements which vary with the nature of the वास्तु. Measures of all kinds required for the smallest वास्तु e. g. bedsteads, सिंहासन mouldings, ornaments etc., to the largest e. g. streets, townships, highways across the country etc. are prescribed at great length in समराङ्गण°. These measures start from the lowest basic unit i. e. a very minute particle of dust floating in the air, and rise, in gradational series, eventually to the highest योजन etc. Such an all embracing nature of these tables notwithstanding, it is really surprising to notice that a kind of measurement used in the design of several Royal Appendages, and defined in युक्ति° has not even been hinted at in समराङ्गण°. This system of measurement is allied to the decimal system used for Scientific purposes, as each succeeding measure in this system forms a multiple of ten with regard to the one preceding it. This table of measures is appended hereunder for facility of reference.

10	हस्तs	of a king	make one	राजहस्त
10	राजहस्तs		one	राजदण्ड
10	राजदण्डs		one	राजछत्र
10	राजछत्रs		one	राजकाण्ड
10	राजकाण्डs		one	राजपुरुष
10	राजपुरुषs		one	राजप्रधानी
10	राजप्रधानीs		one	राजक्षेत्र.

c 3 Similarly, there is another table of measures wherein 9 takes the place of 10 as under--

9	तन्तुs	make	one	सूत्र
9	सूत्रs	„	one	गुण
9	गुणs	„	one	पाश
9	पाशs	„	one	रश्मि
9	रश्मिs	„	one	रज्जु.

It would be tiresome if I were to jot down in details all the uncommon ideas. I shall, therefore, content myself with a bare enumeration of some of them.

c 4 Division of नगरी into 16 kinds with its terminology in accordance with their dimensions measured by राजक्षेत्र.

c 5 Determination of the dimensions of a पट्टनम् from the जन्मलग्न of a King.

c 6 Specification for a locality fit for वास्तुकर्म and the exceptions thereto in the case of ग्रहपञ्चक.

c 7 Determination of 8 kinds of वास्तु when measured by राजकाण्ड.

c 8 Division of वाटी (वास्तु) into 18 kinds as derived from a formula $\text{length} \times \text{breadth}$, including their effects on occupants.

19

c 9 Correspondence between तिथि and the fixation of cardinal points of a ग्रह.

c 10 Functions of three doorways राजद्वार, यमद्वार, and अपद्वार in a राजग्रह and the varying distances of प्राचीर in the case of each.

c 11 12 Kinds of राजग्रह determined from मेधादिचन्द्र at the times of birth of kings, their names, dimensions, अधिदेवता, (ग्रह) the number of doorways with varying colours of आवृतानि, and houses covered by पट्टs of different colours, suitable for every one of them.

c 12 Disposition of minerals on the top of houses to ward off evil influences, even death.

c 13 Adjustments of measurements for 8 pieces of timber in खट्टा of 8 kinds from सर्वषोडशिका to सर्वत्रिंशतिका, including their names.

c 14 प्राचीर— its numbers in राजग्रह and dimensions.

8 The non-existence of ideas expressed above could not be made to construe that the author of समराङ्गण° was not aware at least of some, if not all. Verses 9 and 10, page 62, Part I अनया युक्त्या कर्तव्यम् etc.

The author may have ignored them or rather thought it insignificant, on account of rare usage etc, for incorporation of them in a standard work. The author of युक्ति°, on the other hand, has made the most of them, as he includes them in the युक्तis which form the products of a कल्पतरु.

It stands to reason to assume that one or two view points could be left out of consideration from a standard treatise as समराङ्गण° is. When, however, a host of views on diverse matters is conspicuous by its absence, the question of penmanship assumes an unusual character.

9 Now, the last and at the same time, the most unrefutable factor in deciding the authorship—The Contrast in Specifications--

a युक्ति° sanctions वैशाख, श्रावण, आषाढ, मार्ग, फाल्गुन and कार्तिक months as acceptable for starting the construction of houses. vide. V. 212.

वैशाखश्रावणाषाढमार्गफाल्गुनकार्तिकाः सुप्रशस्ता गृहारम्भे पत्नीपुत्रसमृद्धिदाः ॥

समराङ्गण° on the other hand, lays down that in this respect, आषाढ and कार्तिक bring down destruction of beasts and servants respectively to occupants of such houses. Vide verses 6 and 7, page 246, Part I.

चैत्रे शोककरं वैश्व, ज्येष्ठे मृत्युप्रदायकं । पशुनाशनमाषाढे, शून्यं भाद्रपदे कृतम् ॥६॥
आश्विने कलहाय स्यात् कार्तिके मृत्युनाशनम् । माघे चाग्नि ॥ ७ ॥

b Certain kinds of trees are considered as objectionable in the vicinity of Royal Palaces, temples, and dwelling houses in townships. The following verses describe them and it will be found that दाडिमी is included in the list of trees as being not acceptable in समराङ्गण°. Verses 130-131, page 255, Part I.

कटुकण्टकिदुर्गन्धिगुह्यकायाभयाद् द्रुमान् ।

न धारयेत् समीपस्थान् पुरप्रासादवैश्वनाम् ॥ १३० ॥

बद्री कदली चैव दाडिमी बीजपूरिका ।

प्ररोहन्ति गृहे पत्रं, तद् गृहं न प्ररोहति ॥ १३१ ॥

युक्ति° on the contrary, prescribes this very दाडिमी as a bringer of prosperity—

यत्र यत्र स्थिता वृक्षा, बिल्वदाडिमकेशराः ॥ ३२३ ॥

पनसा नारिकेलाश्च शुभं कुर्वन्ति निश्चयं ।

निशा नीली पलाशश्च चित्रा श्वेतापराजिता ॥ ३२४ ॥

c समराङ्गण° Part I, page 67 Verses 19-20-21.

कर्णिकारधवप्लक्षकपित्थविषमच्छदाः ।

शिरीषोदुम्बराश्वत्थशेलून्यग्रोधचम्पकाः ॥ १९ ॥

निम्बाभ्रकोविदाराक्षव्याधिघाताश्च गर्हिताः ।

गृहकर्मणि नेष्टास्ते यतस्तेऽनिष्टदायिनः ॥ २० ॥

नेष्टाः कण्टकिनः स्वादुफलाः क्षीरदुग्माश्रये ।

सुगन्धयश्च ये तद्वद् ध्रुवं तेषु पशुक्षयः ॥ २१ ॥

Again— Ibid. page 154 Verse, 5.

गृहकर्मणि येनेष्टा वृक्षास्तेऽत्रापि निन्दिताः ॥

समराङ्गण°, it will be clear from the above, specifies certain trees as unfit for building materials, (गृहकर्मणि नेष्टास्ते). Further, while specifying the usefulness or otherwise of different kinds of timber for शयन (bedstead), आसन (seat) etc, the author of समराङ्गण° adds that whatever timber is undesirable as a building material is equally so, so far as those articles of furniture are concerned. निम्ब is one of the trees included in the above list as unsuitable for building purposes. Evidently, therefore, it cannot be accepted as a useful material for the articles of furniture mentioned above. Moreover, the use of निम्ब tree which is unsuitable for ordinary आसन even, should be absolutely prohibited according to समराङ्गण° in the construction of सिंहासन, as the latter forms a specialized kind of आसन. युक्ति°, on the contrary, prescribes this very (गर्ह्य) objectionable material for use in one of the 8 kinds of सिंहासन, and attributes to that timber, besides, the property of bestowing on the user, Prosperity, Victory, Wealth and Health. Verses 372 to 374, page 53 युक्ति° are quoted as under,

निम्बकाष्ठनेघटना शृङ्गमालोपशोभितम् ॥ ३७२ ॥

इन्द्रनीलमहानीलैः काञ्चनेनापि चित्रितम् ।

चरणाग्रे मृगशिरश्चत्वारिंशच्च पुत्रिकाः ॥ ३७३ ॥

नीलवस्त्रादि युक्तं च मृगसिंहासनं मतम् ।

लक्ष्मीविजयसंपत्तिनैरुज्यं प्रदमुत्तमम् ॥ ३७४ ॥

Not only is युक्ति° thus very positive (Verses 377 and 378) in specifications but, also, it does not brook any the slightest deviation whatsoever from its prescriptions except on penalty of death.

d In the design of any वास्तु, its dimensions-viz, length, breadth and height or thickness, are arrived at after due adjustments made in accordance with certain principles laid down for it. These principles are embodied in the form of certain relations or formulas which constitute the अङ्गs of a वास्तु. In this connection, be it noted that the choice of dimensions is deemed most happy when it (वास्तु) secures the greatest satisfaction of these relations. The greater the agreement of these relations it secures, the closer it approximates to an ideal stage dimensionally. These अङ्गs are आय, व्यय, नक्षत्र, अंशक, तारा etc. Their number varies with different writers, the maximum reaching as high as 27. It is not the purpose here to enter into the details of these formulas and the rules to be observed thereunder, except for a certain arithmetical technicality in their derivations. आयs are 8 in number, determined by remainders in the division of $\frac{\text{length} \times \text{breadth}}{8}$

Similarly, व्ययs are also 8 obtained by remainders of the division of $\frac{\text{नक्षत्र}}{8}$.

नक्षत्रs are 27 determined in the same way, from remainders in $\frac{\text{length} \times \text{breadth} \times 8}{27}$.

Remainders in $\frac{\text{व्यय} + \text{क्षेत्रफल} + \text{गृहनामाक्षराणि}}{3}$ give 3 अंशकाः and so forth, for 9 ताराs where the divisor is 9.

It may be pointed out that in a division, the remainders can never equal, but should invariably be less by one than the divisor. Thus the आयs, व्ययs, नक्षत्रs, अंशकs and ताराs could never be 8, 8, 27, 3 and 9 (equal to the divisors in each case) but should be one less viz. 7, 7, 26, 2 and 8, though really they are not so. An anomaly such as this is common not only to समराङ्गण° but many other books on वास्तु also. It is, strange, however, that युक्ति° is free from this anomaly, e. g. 18 kinds of बाटी in that work are derived from 18 remainders left out of $\frac{\text{length} \times \text{breadth}}{19}$ the

divisor being one more than the kinds of बाटी.

Divergence in specifications as to the number of doorways in राजगृह is so wide that there could be no reconciliation in the view points of both युक्ति° and समराङ्गण°. युक्ति° page 38 lays down,

नैकद्वारं वास्तुखण्डं न चतुर्द्वारमारभेत् ।

एकद्वारं दुःसरणं, चतुर्द्वारं दुरापहम् ॥ २२७ ॥

त्रिद्वारमेव नृपतेर्वास्तुकर्म प्रशस्यते ।

द्वे मुख्ये तत्र चान्यत्स्यादमुख्यमिति निर्णयः ॥ २२८ ॥

समराङ्गण°, on the other hand, in अध्याय 30th which treats of राजगृह in details, prescribes 4 doorways in various palaces described therein. e. g.,

पृथिवीजय—Verse 6 द्वाराणि चास्य चत्वारि etc.

सुक्तकोण—Verse 42 पृथ्वीजयवदत्रापि शेषनिर्माणमिष्यते ।

सर्वतोभद्र—Verse 57 दिक्षु सर्वास्वयं प्रोक्तो विधिर्भद्रप्रकल्पने ॥

क्षोणीभूषण—Verse 98 चतुर्द्वारमिदं कार्यं यशः श्रीकीर्तिवर्धनम् ॥

लक्ष्मीविलास—Verse 117 चतुर्द्वारं भवदेतेदिच्छया क्षणमध्यगम् ।

द्वारमन्यद् विधातव्यं स्वपदे स्यात् सुशोभितम् ॥

10 The above illustrations of divergent specifications, it is believed, are sufficient to show the non-identity of authors. If the authors of युक्ति° and समराङ्गण° were one and the same individual, it would be wellnigh impossible to reconcile such diametrically opposite prescriptions. It is as plain as anything that one and the same person would never dictate in one and the same breadth, specifications conflicting one with the other in such a marked manner. Under the circumstances, no room is left but to accept the contention of different Bhojas as authors of युक्ति° and समराङ्गण°.

11 To sum up, the opening verses, colophons, manner and method of treatment, dissimilarity in language as revealed by non-existence of several words and set phrases, and in ideas, by the total absence of certain conceptions, in some places, and complete divergence in others—all these peculiarities both in the subject matter and method of treatment—go to prove beyond a shadow of doubt that the works have emanated from different individuals and that if one of these is the product of King Bhoja of चारानगरी, the other can never be his.

**FURTHER LIGHT ON RĀVAṆA'S LĀṆKĀ LOCATED IN
CENTRAL INDIA FROM VĀLMĪKI'S RĀMĀYAṆA**

BY

M. V. KIBE, M. A.

I

In a paper of mine read before the XVII International Congress of Orientalists held at Oxford, I have given mileage of the distance between Citrakūṭa and Kiṣkindhā as 98.

Thus four Yojanas as stated in Aranyakāṇḍa (3) Sarga 11 Ślokas 38 and 39 were interlocated by me as 32 miles, and three Krośas in Aranyakāṇḍa Sarga 5 śloka 69 as 6 miles. I did so in other places too.

The above mileage can be tested from the distance between two known places viz. the Gaṅgā at its junction with Yamunā at Allahabad and the Citrakūṭa Mountain situated in the Banda District of the United Provinces in the North-west or West of Allahabad.

In Ayodhyākāṇḍa (2) Sarga 54 and Ślokas 28 and 29 Bhāradvāja whose hermitage was on the junction on the Gaṅgā and Yamunā informs Rāma that 10 Krośas from there was situated the mountain Citrakūṭa where he should stay. Thus:—

दशक्रोश इतस्तात गिरिर्यस्मिन्निवस्यसि ।

... ..

चित्रकूट इति ख्यातो.....

In the next Sarga in Ślokas 4 to 6 he gives further directions for reaching the place. He says that from the junction of the two Rivers, the Ganges and Yamunā, they should follow the latter upwards from its mouth and having reached an old landing place they should cross it by making a boat and reach a big Nyagrodha tree which has big leafy branches and after having gone only a Krośa further, they will see a blue forest. Thus:—

गङ्गायमुनयोः संधिमासाय... ..

 कालिन्दीमनुगच्छेतां नदीं पश्चान्मुखाभिताम् ।

 तस्यास्तीर्थं प्रचरितं पुराणं प्रेक्ष्य राघवौ ॥
 तत्र यूयं प्लवं कृत्वा तरतांशुमतीं नदीम् ।
 ततो न्यग्रोधमासाय महान्तं हरितच्छदम् ॥

 क्रोशमात्रं ततो गत्वा नीलं द्रक्ष्यथ काननम् ॥

The Muni Bhāradvāja also adds in the Śloka 9 that he has been often over this road to Citrakūṭa. Thus:—

स पन्थाश्चित्रकूटस्य गतः सुबहुशो मया ॥

Accordingly Rāma made a boat and having put Sītā on it first, crossed the river (Ślokas 18 and 19). Thus:—

प्लवे... ..रामश्चक्रे सहायुधैः ।
 आरोप्य प्रथमं सीतां... .. ॥
 ततः प्रतेरतुर्युक्ता प्रीतौ दशरथात्मजौ ।

Having done so they went a distance of one Krośa, they wandered in the forest of Yamunā, evidently this being the same place which is mentioned in Śloka 8 (supra) and Śloka 33. Thus:—

... ..क्रोशमात्रं ततो गत्वा भ्रातरौ रामलक्ष्मणौ ॥

बहून् मेघ्यान् मृगान् हत्वा चैरतुर्यमुनावने

Later when Bharata came with his army in the wake of Rāma to the hermitage of Bhāradvāja and asked for the whereabouts of the former, he pointed out that three and half Yojanas from there was the Citrakūṭa Mountain where Rāma was staying. As Bharata was accompanied by a big retinue Bhāradvāja pointed out to him another route but the distance although mentioned in two different methods of calculating it, viz. Krośas and Yojanas, 10 Krośas (i. e. 20 miles) are almost equal to $3\frac{1}{2}$ Yojanas (i. e. about 9 Krośas), having regard to perhaps different places for crossing the river (Yamunā) as the route pointed out is to the South or South-west (Sarga 9, Ślokas 10, 11, 13, and 14). Thus:—

भरतार्थतृतीयेषु योजनेष्वजने वने ।

चित्रकूटो गिरिस्तत्र... .. ॥ १० ॥

... ..

उत्तरं पार्श्वमासाद्य तस्य मन्दाकिनी नदी ।..... ॥ ११ ॥

दक्षिणेन एव मार्गेण सव्यदक्षिणमेव वा ।

गजवाजिरथाकीर्णां वाहिनीं वाहिनीपते ॥ १३ ॥

वाहयस्व महाभाग ततो द्रक्ष्यसि राघवम् ।..... ॥ १४ ॥

Having followed this direction Bharata came to the vicinity of Citrakūṭa and said to his chief adviser that the place pointed out by Bhāradvāja had been reached (Sarga 93, and Ślokas 6, 7 and 8). Thus:—

... .. उवाच भरतः श्रीमान् वशिष्ठं मन्त्रिणां वरम् ॥ ६ ॥

... .. व्यक्तं प्राप्ताः स्म तं देशं भारद्वाजो यममवीत् ॥ ७ ॥

अयं गिरिश्चित्रकूट इयं मन्दाकिनी नदी ।

एतत्प्रकाशते वूराक्षीलमेघनिभं वनम् ॥ ८ ॥

The description of the bluish forest has reference to what was stated in Sarga 55, Śloka 8 supra. Now the shortest distance between the bank of the Yamunā and Citrakūṭa is between 20 and 30 miles, although it is 80 miles by rail from the junctions of the two rivers.

This test should leave no doubt as regards the distance between Citrakūṭa and Kiṣkindhā as calculated by me in my last paper.

II

In the 32nd Sarga of Aranyakāṇḍa (4) it is stated that when Śūrpanakhā saw Trisīras, Khara and Duṣaṇa with their army killed by Rāma singly, filled with grief she went to Lankā, protected by Rāvaṇa, from Daṇḍakāraṇya, (Śloka 3). Thus:—

जगाम परमोद्विग्ना लङ्कां रावणपालिताम् ॥ ३ ॥

Then Rāvaṇa went to the stables, asked his charioteer to yoke the mules who did it in a moment and in his golden chariot came to the ocean. (Sarga 35, Ślokas 4, 5, 6 and 7). Thus:—

यानशालां ततो गत्वा पृच्छन्तो राक्षसाधिपः ।

सूतं संबोदयामास रथः संयोज्यतामिति ॥ ४ ॥

एवमुक्तः क्षणेनैव सारथिर्लघुविक्रमः ।

रथं संयोजयामास तस्याभिमतमुत्तमम् ॥ ५ ॥

काञ्चनं रथमास्थाय कामगं रत्नभूषितम् ।

... .. ॥ ६ ॥

... ..

राक्षसाधिपतिः श्रीमान् ययौ नदनदीपतीम् ॥ ७ ॥

He then crossed the sea and in a lovely and beautiful place in the forest saw the Rākṣasa named Mārīca (Sarga Ibid Ślokas 37 and 38). Thus :—

ते तु गत्वा परं पारं समुद्रस्य नदीपतेः ।

ददर्शाश्रममेकान्ते रम्ये पुण्ये वनान्तरे ॥ ३७ ॥

... ..

ददर्श नियताहारं मारीचं नाम राक्षसम् ॥ ३८ ॥

Rāvaṇa induced Mārīca to accompany him on his chariot to the place where Rāma was staying to decoy Sītā (Sarga 42, Ślokas 7, 8, 9 and 11). Thus :—

आरुह्यतामयं शीघ्रं खगो रत्नाविभूषितः ।...॥ ७ ॥

प्रलोभयित्वा वेदेहीं यथेष्टं गन्तुमर्हसि ।...॥ ८ ॥

ततो रावणमारीचो विमानमिव ते रथम् ।

आरुह्य ययतुः शीघ्रं तस्मादाश्रममण्डलात् ॥ ९ ॥

... .. ॥ १० ॥

समेत्य दण्डकारण्यं राघवस्याश्रमं ततः ।

ददर्श सहमारीचो रावणो राक्षसाधिपः ॥ ११ ॥

It is noteworthy that it is particularly stated in the passage underlined that from their hermitage (that of Mārīca) they came soon to the place where Rāma had built his cottage.

It appears that while Rāvaṇa came to the place in a chariot, which was destroyed by Jaṭāyu, when the former was taking Sītā away, on his way back he had the use of a sort of a glider (Sarga 67, Ślokas 17 and 20). Thus :—

... विष्वंसितरथच्छत्रः ... ॥ १७ ॥

... .. ॥ १८ ॥

... .. ॥ १९ ॥

जातामोक्षं वेदेहीमुत्पपात विहायसः...॥ २० ॥

In Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa (4) Sarga 6, Ślokas 9, 10 and 11 Sugrīva says that he saw Sītā being dragged by Rāvaṇa when seeing him and his followers she threw down on the peak her covering garment and some ornaments. It is however not clear from this nor from a similar description of the manner of her being taken away by Sampātī in Sarga 58 and Śloka 15 whether she was being dragged on earth or by air. Thus :—

हियमाणा मया वृष्टा रक्षसा क्रूरकर्मणा ॥ ९ ॥

... ..

उत्तरीयं तथा त्यक्तं ॥ ११ ॥

हियमाणा मया वृष्टा रावणेन दुरात्मना ॥ १५ ॥

It will be evident from the above narrative that neither in the journey of Rāvaṇa, with Mārīca, to Janasthāna, where Rāma was staying, nor on his return journey with Sītā, is there any mention of the formidable obstruction of the ocean. On the contrary he seems to have crossed it easily. It clearly appears that he had to use two chariots one to the sea from Laṅkā and other from the hermitage of Mārīca, which was near to the sea. Aranya-kāṇḍa (3) Sarga 35, Ślokas 37 and 10. Thus :—

ते तु गत्वा परं पारं समुद्रस्य नदीपतेः ।

ददर्शाश्रममेकान्ते रम्ये पुण्ये वनान्तरे ॥ ३७ ॥

कामगं रथमास्थाय शुशुभे राक्षसेश्वरः ॥ १० ॥

III

Now those who maintain that the the sea or the ocean which surrounded the island of Laṅkā was in the South of India base their argument on the mention of the names of Mountains Sahya, Malaya and Mahendra, which are well known mountains at the extreme end of the Southern peninsula of India. (Yuddhakāṇḍa (6), Sarga 4 Ślokas 73, 74, 95, 96 and 97). Thus :—

सह्यपर्वतमासेदुर्मलयं च महीधरम् ।...॥ ७३ ॥

पश्यन्नभिययौ रामः सह्यस्य मलयस्य च ।...॥ ७४ ॥

... ..

... ..महेन्द्रमथ संप्राप्य रामो राजीवलोचनः ॥ ९५ ॥

ततः शिखरमारुह्य रामो दशरथात्मजः ॥ ९६ ॥

कूर्ममीनसमाकीर्णमपश्यत्सलिलाकरम्... ॥ ९७ ॥

But apart from the fact that this lengthy Sarga appears to be later interpolation, there is evidence to show that the Malaya and Mahendra were the names of forts or peaks near Kiskindhā.

In Aranyakāṇḍa (3) Sarga 72, Śloka 12, it is stated that Sugrīva had to live on the mountain Rṣyamūka which spread up to Pampā, which was a lake (Aranyakāṇḍa Sarga 73, Śloka 11). Thus:—

ऋष्यमूके गिरिवरे पम्पापर्यन्तशोभिते ।

and

ततः पुष्करिणीं वीरौ पम्पां नाम गमिष्यथ ।

In Kiskindhākāṇḍa (4) Sarga 2 it is stated that seeing Rāma in the neighbourhood of Rṣyamūka (Sarga 1, Śloka 129) Sugrīva and his followers became terrified (Sarga 2, Śloka 1) fearing that Vāli had sent them (Śloka 13). Then Hanumān assured them that the place where they were standing i. e. the hill named Malaya, on which was situated Rṣyamūka, was beyond the pale of Vāli (Śloka 14). Thus:—

तावृष्यमूकस्य समीपचारी चरन्

... ..

ततस्तं भयसंविग्रं वालिकिल्बिषशङ्कितम् ।

उवाच हनुमान् वाक्यं सुग्रीवं वाक्यकोविदः ॥

संभ्रमस्त्यज्यतामेष सर्वे वालिकृते महान् ।

मलयोऽयं गिरिवरो भयं नेहास्ति वालिनः ॥

That the place mentioned above was in the neighbourhood of Rṣyamūka is seen from Sarga 3 Ślokas 1, 2 and 21 to 23. Thus:—

वचो विज्ञाय हनुमान् सुग्रीवस्य महात्मना ।

पर्वतावृष्यमूकान्तु पुष्टुवे यत्र राघवौ ॥ १ ॥

... ..

प्राप्तोऽहं प्रेषितस्तेन सुग्रीवेण महात्मना ।

राज्ञा वानरमुख्यानां हनुमान्नाम वानरः ॥ २१ ॥

... ..

तस्य मां सचिवं वित्तं वानरं पवनात्मजं... ।

... ..ऋष्यमूकादिह प्राप्तं... .. ॥ १२ ॥

Then Hanumān went to R̥ṣyamūka itself which was the abode of Sugriva (Aranyakāṇḍa (3) sarga 72 Śloka 12 supra), to Mala-yagiri from where they had seen Rāma and his brother wandering near R̥ṣyamūka Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa (4), Sarga 5, Śloka 1. Thus:--

ऋष्यमूकात् हनुमान् गत्वा तं मलयं गिरिम् ।

आचक्षे तदा वीरौ कपिराजाय राघवौ ॥ १ ॥

Vāli, the opponent of Sugriva, lived at Kiṣkindhā (Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa (4) Sarga 11, Śloka 21). Thus:--

वाली नाम महाप्राज्ञः शक्रतुल्यपराक्रमः ।

अध्यास्ते वानरः श्रीमान् किष्किन्धामतुलप्रभाम् ॥ २१ ॥

This place was at a distance of one Yojana (4 miles) from the hermitage of Mataṅga (Sarga 11, Ślokas 46, 47 and 48). Thus:--

पपात च महाकायः क्षिती पञ्चत्वमागतः ।

तं तोलयित्वा बाहुभ्यां गतसत्त्वमचेतनम् ॥ ४६ ॥

चिक्षेप बलवान् वाली वेगेनैकेन योजनम् ।...॥ ४७ ॥

प्रपेतुर्मातुस्तप्तिता मतङ्गस्याश्रमे प्रति ।...॥ ४८ ॥

This hermitage of Mataṅga was at a distance of 12 miles from Janasthāna, where Rāma had lost his wife (Aranyakāṇḍa (3) Sarga 69, Ślokas 5 and 8). Thus.

ततःपरं जनस्थानात्त्रिक्रोशं गम्य राघवौ ।

कौञ्चारण्यं विविशतुर्गहनं ती महौजसौ ॥ ५ ॥

... ..

ततः पूर्वेण तौ गत्वा त्रिक्रोशं भ्रातरी तदा ।

कौञ्चारण्यमतिक्रम्य मतङ्गाश्रममन्तरे ॥ ८ ॥

From R̥ṣyamūka Sugriva was asked to immediately proceed to Kiṣkindhā (Sarga 12, Ślokas 12 and 14). Thus:--

अस्मद्गच्छेम किष्किन्धां क्षिप्रं गच्छ त्वमग्रतः ।...॥ १३ ॥

सर्वे ते त्वरितं गत्वा किष्किन्धां वालिनः पुरीम् ।...॥ १४ ॥

Sugriva was hotly pursued by Vāli upto Malaya forest (Ślokas 22 and 23). Thus:--

... ..

वालिनाभिद्रुतः क्रोधात् प्रविवेश महावनम् ॥ २२ ॥

तं प्रविष्टं वनं द्रष्ट्वा वाली शापमयार्दितः ।

... ..स निवृत्तो महायुतिः ॥ २३ ॥

Rāma accompanied by Lakṣmaṇa and Sugrīva went to Kiṣkindhā from Rṣyamūka. In the way they met a broken grove named Sapta Janasthāna. From here they saw Kiṣkindhā (Sarga 13, Śloka 1, 13, 29 and Sarga 14. Śloka 1). Thus:—

ऋष्यमूकात्स धर्मात्मा किष्किन्धां लक्ष्मणाग्रजः ।

जगाम सह सुग्रीवो बालिविक्रमपालिताम् ॥ १ ॥

... ..

तेषां तु गच्छतां तत्र त्वरितं रघुनन्दनः... ..

ते गत्वा दूरमध्वानं तस्मात्सप्तजनाश्रमात् ।

ददृशुस्तां वुराधर्षा किष्किन्धां बालिपालिताम् ॥ २९ ॥

... ..

सर्वे ते त्वरितं गत्वा किष्किन्धां बालिपालिताम् ।...॥ १ ॥

All this description shows that there was not much distance between Rṣyamūka and Kiṣkindhā. The latter was in a valley (Sarga 27, Śloka 1 and Sarga 26, Śloka 7). Thus:—

अभिषिक्ते तु सुग्रीवे प्रविष्टे वानरे गुहाम् ।...॥ १ ॥

... ..

इमां गिरिगुहां रम्यामभिगन्तुमितोऽर्हसि ।...॥ ७ ॥

This is made clear in Sarga 31 Śloka 16, Thus:—

तामपश्यद्वलाकीर्णी हरिराज महापुरीम् ।

दुर्गमिक्ष्वाकुशार्दूलः किष्किन्धां गिरिसङ्कटे ॥ १६ ॥

and Rāma with his brother went to live on the Prasravaṇa Mountain (Sarga 27, Śloka 1). Thus:—

... ..आजगाम सह भ्रात्रा रामः प्रलवणं गिरिम् ॥ १ ॥

In the neighbourhood also were in the North a peak and in the South a peak named Kailāsa and on the East a river flowing by a peak known as Trikūṭa (Sarga 27, Śloka 14, 15, 16, 26 and 27). Thus:—

गिरिशृङ्गमिदं तात पश्य चोत्तरतः शुभम् ।...॥ १४ ॥

दक्षिणस्यामपि दिशि स्थितं श्वेतमिवाम्बरम् ।

कैलासशिखरप्रख्यं... .. ॥ १५ ॥

प्राचीनवाहिनीं चैव नदीं... .. ।

गुह्यायाः पूर्वतः पश्य त्रिकूटे... .. ॥ १६ ॥

... ..

इतश्च नातिदूरे सा किष्किन्धा... .. ।

सुग्रीवस्य पुरी रम्या भविष्यति... .. ॥ २६ ॥

गीतवादित्रनिर्घोषः श्रूयते जयतां... .. ।
नर्दतां वानराणां च मृदङ्गाढम्बरैः सह ॥ २७ ॥

Besides Kiṣkindhā there were other forts on the mountain (Sarga 19, Ślokas 14 and 15). Thus:—

रक्ष्यतां नगरद्वारमङ्गदश्वाभिषिच्यताम् ।...। १४ ॥
... ..
आविशन्ति हि दुर्गाणि क्षिप्रमन्यानि वानराः ॥ १५ ॥

During this time Rāma lived on a peak of Prasravana mountain which was known as Mālyavat (Sarga 27, Ślokas 1 and 29 and Sarga 28, Śloka 1). Thus:—

अभिषिक्ते तु सुग्रीवे प्रविष्टे वानरे गुह्यम् ।
आजगाम सह भ्राता रामः प्रस्रवणं गिरिम् ॥ १ ॥
... ..
इत्युक्त्वा न्यवसत्तत्र राघवः सह लक्ष्मणः ।
बहुदृश्यदरीकुञ्जे तस्मिन् प्रस्रवणे गिरौ ॥ २९ ॥
स तथा वालिनं हत्वा सुग्रीवमभिषिच्य च ।
वसन् माल्यवतः पृष्ठे... .. ॥ १ ॥

In Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa (4) Sarga 2 Śloka 14, this Mālyavāt is called Malaya. Thus :—

... ..मलयोऽयं गिरिवरो... .. ॥ १४ ॥

That this Prasravana Mountain otherwise known as Malaya, was in sight of Vindhya at the foot of which was the sea, which divided Lankā from the Vindhya range in a valley of which was Kiṣkindhā is borne out by Sarga 53, Ślokas 12 and 16 Sarga 60 Śloka 6 and Sarga 58, Śloka 34 and Sarga 64, Śloka 2. Thus :—

एष विन्ध्यो गिरिः श्रीमान्नानाद्रुमलताकुलः ।
एष प्रस्रवणः शैलः सागरोऽयं महोदधिः ॥ १२ ॥
... ..
विन्ध्यस्य तु गिरेः पादे संप्रपुष्पितपादपे ।
उपविश्य महात्मानश्चिन्तामापेदिरे तदा ॥ १६ ॥
अस्य विन्ध्यस्य शिखरे पतितोऽस्मि पुरा ह्ययम्...॥ ६ ॥
... ..
समुद्रं नेतुमिच्छामि भवन्निर्वरुणालयम् ॥ ३४ ॥
संपातेः बचनं श्रुत्वा हरयो रावणक्षयम् ।
हृष्टा सागरमाजग्मुः सीतादर्शनकाङ्क्षिणः ॥ २ ॥

So when Hanumān, who was among the above army made his mind to cross the ocean, he observed that the ground below his feet being soft will not be able to bear the repurcursion of his leap (Kīṣkindhākāṇḍa (4) Sarga 67, Śloka 37). Thus :—

नेयं मम मही वेगं लङ्घने धारयिष्यति ।...॥ ३७ ॥

So he pointed out to the peaks of Mahendra Mountain as firm enough to bear his burden and ascended one of them (Sarga 67. Ślokas 38 and 41). Thus :—

शिखराणि महेन्द्रस्य स्थिराणि च महान्ति च ।

एषु वेगं करिष्यामि महेन्द्रशिखरेष्वहम् ॥ ३८ ॥

... ..
आरुरोह नगश्रेष्ठं महेन्द्रमरिर्मदनः ।...॥ ४१ ॥

This Mahendra was a peak of Vindhya is shown by the narrative in Sarga 63. Śloka 14 and Sarga 64 Ślokas 1 and 2 according to which Sampāti, who was on a peak of the Vindhyas flew away from it followed by Hanumān and others to the banks of the sea. Thus :—

उत्पपात गिरेः शृङ्गात् ।... ..॥ १४ ॥

... ..
आख्याता गृध्रराजेन समुत्पत्य प्लवंगमाः ।...॥ १ ॥

... ..
इष्टाः सागरमाजग्मुः सीतादर्शनकाङ्क्षिणः ॥ २ ॥

Here as seen later (infra) Rāma ascended the Mahendra.

On his return from Laṅkā Hanumān and others ascended the peak of Mahendra and leaving it ran to where Rāma was. Sundarakāṇḍa (Sarga 60, Śloka 13, and Sarga 61 Śloka 2). Thus:—

तस्माद्गच्छाम वै सर्वे यत्र रामः सलक्ष्मणः ।...॥ १३ ॥

... ..
महेन्द्राग्रं परित्यज्य पुच्छुवुः प्लवगर्षभाः ॥ २ ॥

Here also came Rāma (Yuddhakāṇḍa (6), Sarga 4, Śloka 95 and 96). Thus :—

... ..
महेन्द्रमथ संप्राप्य रामो राजीवलोचनः ॥ ९५ ॥

अध्यारोहन्महाबाहुः शिखरं द्रुमभूषितम् ।...॥ ९६ ॥

He came here from Prasravaṇa Mountain where Hanumān had reported his success to him (Sundarakāṇḍa (5) Sarga 65, Śloka 1). Thus:--

ततः प्रस्रवणं शैलं ते गत्वा चित्रकाननम् ।

प्रणम्य शिरसा रामं लक्ष्मणं च महाबलम् ॥ १ ॥

But in this lengthy chapter 4 of Yuddhakāṇḍa in which Rāma's journey to the sea and his ascending of Mahendra is described, there appear to have crept in some interpolations, such as in 73, 74, 97 and 98, the meaning of which is also obscure. Ślokas 73 and 74 say that Rāma reached the Sahya and Malaya Mountains, and a river which is full of water or the name of which was Prasravaṇa. Thus:--

सह्यपर्वतमासेदुर्मलयं च महीधरम् ।

काननानि विचित्राणि नदीप्रस्रवणानि च ॥ ७ ॥

पश्यन्नभिययौ रामः सह्यस्य मलयस्य च ।...॥ ७४ ॥

If the latter interpretation is correct then the river might have been named after the mountain on which Rāma was living near Kiṣkindhā, as it might have had its source there. Then Sahya and Malaya appear to be synonyms and Malaya was another name for Prasravaṇa as seen above.

But Ślokas 96 to 100 are not clear. They appear to mean that Rāma had ascended the peak of Mahendra, he saw the sea at a distance but in between were Sahya and Malaya, and having ascended from the peak he crossed a beautiful forest reaching upto the sea coast and said to Sugrīva that they had reached the sea. Thus:--

... ..ततः शिखरमारुह्य रामो दशरथात्मजः ॥ ९६ ॥

... ..
ते सह्यं समतिक्रम्य मलयं च महागिरिम् ॥ ९७ ॥

आसेदुरानुपूर्व्येण समुद्रं भीमनिःस्वनम्... .. ॥

अवरुह्य जगामाहु वेलावनमनुत्तमम् ॥ ९८ ॥

... ..
वेलामासाय विपुलां रामो वचनमब्रवीत् ।

एते वयमनुप्राप्ताः सुग्रीवस्य वरुणालयम् ॥ १०० ॥

But the above does not mean that Rāma crossed the mountain ranges named Sahya and Malaya.

Reference has been made to the existence of a mountain known as Trikūṭa with a river flowing by to the East of the cave in which Rāma had taken his abode. (Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa (4). Sarga 27, Śloka 16 and 4). Thus:—

प्राचीनवाहिनीं चैव नदीं भृशमकर्दमाम् ।
गुहायाः पूर्वतः पश्य त्रिकूटे जाह्नवीमिव ॥ १६ ॥
तस्य शैलस्य शिखरे महतीमायतां गुहाम् ।
प्रत्यगृह्णीत वासार्थं रामः सौमित्रिणा सह ॥ ४ ॥

This Trikūṭa which was observed to the East of Malaya, or Prasravaṇa, with a river between, was in the vicinity of Lankā (Yuddhakāṇḍa (7). Sarga 11, Śloka 22, 24 and 49 and Sarga 40, Śloka 2 and 3). Thus:—

त्रिकूटस्थः स तु तदा दशग्रीवो निशाचरः ।
प्रेषयामास दौत्येन प्रहस्तं वाक्यकोविदं ॥ २२ ॥
... ..
इयं लङ्कापुरी राजन् राक्षसानां महात्मनाम्...॥ २४ ॥
... ..
विवेश नगरीं लङ्कां... ..॥ ४९ ॥
स्थित्वा मुहुर्तं तत्रैव दिशो दश विलोकयन् ।
त्रिकूटशिखरे रम्ये... ..॥ २ ॥
ददर्श लङ्कां सुन्यस्तां रम्यकाननशोभिताम्...॥ ३ ॥

IV

That the distance between the North bank and the South bank of the sea dividing the Continent from the Island of Lankā was not great is evident from Yuddhakāṇḍa (6). Sarga 17, Śloka 1, 9, 10 and Sarga 19 Śloka 1 and 2). Disregarded by his brother, Rāvaṇa, Bibhīṣaṇa came to the Northern Coast of the Sea, when Rāma had reached the Southern Coast. There he stood on a high ground (“ गगनस्थ ” and स्वस्थ एव व्यतिष्ठत) and loudly spoke (उवाच स्वरेण महता). Thus:—

... ..आजगाम मुहूर्तेन यत्र रामः सलक्ष्मणः ॥ ॥
... ..गगनस्थं महीस्थास्ते ददृशुर्वानराधिपाः ॥ २ ॥

... ... सविभीषणः ।
 उत्तरं तीरमासाद्य स्वस्थ एव व्यतिष्ठत ॥ १० ॥

 राघवेणाभये दत्ते संनतो रावणानुजः ।
 विभीषणो महाप्राज्ञो भूमिं समवलोकयन् ॥ १ ॥
 खात्पतातावनीं हृष्टो भक्तेरनुचरैः सह ।
 स तु रामस्य धर्मात्मा निपपात विभीषणः ॥ २ ॥

At his instance was built the Setu for crossing the (Sarga 19, Ślokas 32, 33, 39 and 40). Thus:—

... ... एवं विभीषणेनोक्तो राक्षसेन विपश्चिता ॥ ३२ ॥
 ततश्चाख्यातुमारेभे विभीषणवचः शुभम् ॥ ३३ ॥

 किमर्थं नो नरव्याघ्र न रोचिष्यति राघव ।
 विभीषणेन यच्चोक्तमास्मिन् काले सुखावहम् ॥ ३९ ॥
 अबद्धा सागरे संतुं घोरैऽस्मिन् वरुणालये ।
 लङ्का नासादितुं शक्या सेन्द्रेः अपि सुरासुरैः ॥ ४० ॥

The above shows that the distance between the two coasts although difficult to be crossed by an army without a bridge, loud conversation between the two could be heard. Moreover, a small party could cross it as Bibhishana did (Sarga 19, Ślokas 2 and 3). Thus:—

खात्पतातावनीं हृष्टो भक्तेरनुचरैः सह ।
 स तु रामस्य धर्मात्मा निपपात विभीषणः ॥ २ ॥
 पादयोः शरणान्वेषी... ... ॥ ३ ॥

When visiting Mārīca Ravana too had crossed it. (Aranya-kāṇḍa (3). Sarga 35, Śloka 37). Thus:—

तं तु गत्वा परं पारं समुद्रस्य नदीपतेः ।
 ददर्शाश्रममेकान्ते रम्ये पुण्ये वनान्तरे ॥ ३७ ॥

Moreover, the bed of the river (exaggerated by poetic imagination into a sea) was mainly without mud (Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa (4). Sarga 27, Śloka 16). Thus:—

प्राचीनवाहिनीं चैव नदीं भृशमकर्दमाम् ।... ॥ १६ ॥

SUMMARY

In my paper on 'Rāvaṇa's Laṅkā discovered' read before the XVII International Congress of Orientalists I had located Laṅkā in the Vindhya Mountain on the description of the route of Rāma to Laṅkā, as given in Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa. In the present paper I locate it at the same place on the basis of Rāvaṇa's route to Pañcavaṭī and his subsequent movements.

It is noteworthy that in the Ayodhyākāṇḍa Vālmiki gives the distance between Ayodhyā and Citrakūṭa, both in Krośas and Yojanas, and it tallies exactly with the present location of these two places. It is also noteworthy that against the popular belief that Vālmiki lays stress on the vicinity of Malaya and Sahya to the north bank of the sea which divides Laṅkā from India, these, as a matter of fact, are only mentioned once in a long Adhyāya in Sundarakāṇḍa, which there is reason to suppose, contains many interpolations. On the other hand, Malaya is the name of a fort on a peak of the Vindhya Mountain near Kiśkindhā. As a matter of fact, Vālmiki in many places insists on the vicinity of Vindhya to Laṅkā. All these facts and the fact that Rāvaṇa easily came to Pañcavaṭī and Bibhiṣaṇa spoke to the followers of Rāma from the other side of the sea, dividing India and Laṅkā, lead to the same conclusion as I have arrived in my previous paper.¹

¹ N. B. (1) Important references in Sanskrit quotations have been printed in black type.

N. B. (2) The Edition of Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa used for the purpose of this article—“Śrīmad Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa” Published by R. Narayanaswami Aiyar, M. A., B. L. Advocate, with the help of an editorial committee consisting of Mahāmahopādhyāya Vidyāvācaspati Darśanakalānidhi Professor S. Kuppuswami Sastrigal, M. A., I. E. S., Mahāmahopādhyāya Śāstraratnākara Vedāntavibhūṣaṇa Pandit S. Kṛṣṇa Sastrigal Vedāntavīśārada Vedāntavibhūṣaṇa Pandit S. K. Padmanābha Sastrigal and Vedānta Śiromani Vedāntavīśārada Vedāntalaṅkāra Pandit T. V. Ramechandra Dikshitar. Printed at the Madras Law Journal Press Mylapore, Madras, 1933.

MISCELLANEA

ŚRĪHAṬṬA-NĀGARA AND THE ŚRĪ-GAUḌA BRĀHMAṆAS

BY

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH

The traditions of the Gauḍa Brāhmaṇas point to Gauḍa, in Bengal, as their original home.¹ They are divided into two main sections, viz., the Ādi-Gauḍa, i. e. those who were first to migrate from Gauḍa, and the Śrī-Gauḍa. In speaking of the origin of the last-named of Gujarāt, the *Brāhmaṇotpatti-mārtanḍa* writes,

Purā Gauḍa-Brāhmaṇās-ca Kāśmīra-deśa-vāsinaḥ || 41 ||

Apratigrāhinaḥ sarve Lakṣmī-śāpena bhikṣukāḥ ||

Jātāḥ Śrīhaṭṭa-nagarān-nirgūtās-ca diśo-daśa || 42 ||

Mālava ca gatāḥ kecin-Marudhanve tathā pare ||

Śrī-Gauḍa iti yan-nāma-grāma-Śrī-kāra-yogataḥ || 43 ||

(pp. 433-434).

i. e. " In ancient time the Gauḍa Brāhmaṇas were the residents of the country of Kāśmīra. They were all non-acceptors of gift and were turned to beggars, through the curse of the goddess of fortune. Born in the city of Śrīhaṭṭa, went forth to ten directions, some to Mālava and others to Marudhanva (Rājputānā). They are called Śrī-Gauḍa by the addition of 'Śrī' of their village-name (i. e. Śrīhaṭṭa) ".

Śrīhaṭṭa has been called 'nagara' i. e. city in the third line and again as 'grāma' i. e. village, in the last line of the above extract. This leads us to suspect, whether, 'Śrīhaṭṭa-nagara' is the correct reading. We think that the correct word is 'Śrīhaṭṭa-Nāgara'. This slight change makes the sense clear, without spoiling the metre.

Let us see if our surmise can be supported by facts. In this connection, the word *Bhikṣukāḥ* first attracts our attention. It

¹ *Sup. to Gloss of Ind. Terms*, by Sir H. M. Elliot, pp. 417-20.

reminds us of the *Bhikṣu* or *Bhikṣuka* section of the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas of Gujarāt. These Brāhmaṇas are principally divided into two sections, viz., *Bhikṣu*,¹ i. e. the priestly class, which lives on charities (*pratigraha*), and *Gṛhastha*² who follow all sorts of professions, including government service.³

Again the tradition says that these Brāhmaṇas were formerly the residents of Kāśmīra. This does not seem to be a pure myth. This is capable of proof, if our surmise is accepted. Six years ago, we hinted that the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas of Śrīhaṭṭa might have come from the north-western border of Kāśmīr.⁴ Prof. Bhandarkar has since substantiated this by positive evidence. He has shown that a place named Nāgarakhaṇḍa, in Kāśmīr, is mentioned in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* (VI. 194). This, no doubt, proves the existence of the Nāgaras in Kāśmīr. He identifies this place with the second of the two chiefships denoted by Hunzā-Nāgara, to the extreme north-west of Kāśmīr. He, further, says that the Nāgaras migrated from their original home in Hāṭaka, near Mānasa lake, westward to Kāśmīr. This is also proved by the existence of the Nāgarī class of Brāhmaṇas in Kāśmīr.⁵

Now we shall try to see where this Śrīhaṭṭa was or is. The compiler of the *Brāhmaṇotpatti-mūrtanḍa* in his *bhāṣā-tīkā* has located it in Kāśmīr. He has not given any evidence in support of his assertion, nor have we been able to find any. On the other hand the *Bombay Gazeteer* (Vol. IX., Pt. I., p. ix & n.)

¹ The Nāgaras of Gujarāt attribute the origin of the name of ' *Bhikṣuka* ' to the curse of Indra, and not of Lakṣmī. The origin of the tradition is based on the following verse of the *Skandapurāṇa*, Nāgarakhaṇḍa ch. 206, which says:—

“ *Mama Vākyād-āpi prāṇya ete Lakṣmīm dvijottamāḥ |*
Nirdhanāḥ sambhaviṣyanti nītvā yad-dvūrato' khilam | 163

² As regards vocations and religious customs, these Gṛhasthas have got striking similarities with the Kāyasthas of Bengal, who according to Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar, were originally Nāgara Brāhmaṇas. Sherring, speaking of the Mehtās says:—The Mehtās, moreover, are spoken of as writers, and apparently hold the position of the Kāyastha, or writer caste, in northern India. (*Hindu Tribes and Castes*, Vol I, p. 100). It is very curious indeed that of the different meanings of the word ' *kāya* ', ' *gṛha* ' is one. Thus the words Kāyastha and Gṛhastha etymologically mean the same thing.

³ *Nāgarotpatti* by G. S. Pancoli, pp. 60-61.

⁴ *Ind. Hist. Qly.* Vol. VI, p. 71.

⁵ *Ind. Ant.* 1932, pp. 68-69.

says:-- ' Among the later arrivals of Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas in Gujarāt are the Śrī-Gauḍa Brāhmaṇas from Gauḍa or Bengal by way of Mālava and Dohad '. So according to this evidence Śrīhaṭṭa must have to be looked for in Bengal. In fact there is an ancient place named Śrīhaṭṭa, in Assam, on the eastern border of Bengal.¹ It is the head-quarters of the district of the same name. Not only Śrīhaṭṭa, but there was also a small kingdom named Gauḍa² in this district. The king had his capital at the modern town of Śrīhaṭṭa (Sylhet). This kingdom was conquered by the Muhammadans in the fourteenth century A. D.³ We have already shown that there has been a settlement of the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas in this Śrīhaṭṭa, since about the fifth century A. D.⁴

In enumerating the different kinds of silver, Kautilya, in his *Arthaśāstra*, speaks of a variety named ' Gauḍikam ' or *Gaulikam*.⁵ Bhaṭṭasvāmī, the commentator, interprets this term as ' Kāmarūpajam ' Kautilya's Gauḍa is, no doubt, the Gauḍa in Bengal, which is much older than the other Gauḍa in Śrīhaṭṭa. We do not know what was the extent of Gauḍa in Kautilya's time, nor whether Gauḍa produced any silver. A commodity is known by the name of the country of its production, or by that of its market. We do not know again, if the name of Kāmarūpa is so old

¹ Although Sylhet is now politically under Assam, from the linguistic and ethnological points of view, it still forms a part of Bengal. As far as is known in the latter part of the fifth century, Śrīhaṭṭa was under the kingdom of Kāmarūpa. It is not known how long it remained so. Most probably with the decline of the Kāmarūpa kingdom, there grew up several independent and semi-independent chiefs, who were conquered by the Muhammadans in the fourteenth century. With this conquest it came under Bengal, and remained so till 1874 A. D., when it was transferred to Assam.

² It is interesting to note here that besides Gauḍa, there were two other petty kingdoms, named Magada and Lāḍa. Magada is, no doubt, named after the well-known kingdom of Magadha, by the people migrating from there. Similarly the other two countries, viz., Gauḍa and Lāḍa (Rāḍha = Lāḍha = Lāḍa) were named by the people coming from Gauḍa and Rāḍha of Bengal. This, no doubt, accounts for their linguistic and ethnologic affinity with Bengal. An aboriginal tribe called Rāḍha is found in Mayūrabhañja, on the borders of Rāḍha, and also in the Sylhet district. They are, no doubt, original inhabitants of Rāḍha. Lāṭa or Lāḍha of Gujarāt might have some connection with Rāḍha or Lāḍha of Bengal. We hope some students of ethnology will take up this interesting study.

³ J. A. S. B. — 1922, p. 413.

Ind. Hist. Qly., Vol. VI, pp. 60-71.

as the fourth century B. C. It may be that Kāmarūpa produced silver, which came to be known to the outside provinces through its market, which was Gauḍa in Bengal. Or it may be that in Bhaṭṭasvāmī's time Gauḍa of Bengal was under Kāmarūpa kings, which was about the latter half of the seventh and first quarter of the eighth century A. D. If he is of still later date he might have in view the Gauḍa in Sylhet.

Yaśodhara, the author of the *Jayamaṅgalā* commentary on Vātsyāyan's *Kāmasūtra*, flourished about the middle of thirteenth century. He appears to have known both the Gauḍas. He interprets, 'Gauḍāḥ' as *Kāmarūpakāḥ*, and again writes:—'*Kaliṅga-Gauḍa-viśāyūd-dakṣiṇena*'. It should be noticed here that he makes a distinction between Gauḍa and Gauḍa-viśaya. The first is, no doubt, Gauḍa in Sylhet, which was probably under the Kāmarūpa kings, in the thirteenth century. Gauḍa-viśaya, to the south of which has been placed Kaliṅga, can not but be the Gauḍa of Bengal. In the *Hitopadeśa*, which is considered not later than the twelfth century has '*asti Gauḍa-viśaye Kauśāmbī-nāma-nagari*' Kauśāmbī occurs in the Velābo plate of Bhojavarman,¹ and also in Saṁdhyākara's *Rāmacarita* of about the twelfth century. It has been identified with the village of Kauśāmbī, with considerable ancient remains, in the Rajshahi district, in Bengal.

The Śrīhaṭṭa-Nāgaras, whom we have identified with the present day Sāmpradāyika or Vaidika Brāhmaṇas of Sylhet, know nothing about their coming from Kāśmīr.² On the other hand, some of them claim that their forefathers came from Kanauj, while others say that they came from Mithilā. We find no improbability in either of the two assertions, as both the provinces have got Nāgara settlements. It is not necessary that they should come direct from Kāśmīr. They might have come *via* either or both of the countries.

According to the *Nāgara-puṣpāñjalī* (Vol. I. p. 2). ' Kanaujiā ' is the name of a section of the Kapola-Nāgara division of the Nāgaras. This is supported by epigraphic evidence also. An inscription, in the script of the seventh century, found in the ruins

¹ *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XII, p. 43.

² *Ind. Hist. Qly.*, Vol. VI. p. 68.

of Kudarkot, Gavidhmat, Itāwā district, U P.,¹ records gift of houses to some Brāhmaṇas, with the surnames of Soma, Kirti, Śarmā and Svāmi, like those of the Brāhmaṇas, mentioned in the Nidhanpur grant of Bhāskaravarman, found in the district of Sylhet.² Again Risely says that 'Nāgara' is a hypergamous group of the Maithil Brāhmaṇas.³ It is, therefore, very probable that the Śrīhaṭṭa-Nāgaras came to Sylhet from Kāśmīr, *via* Kanauj and Mithilā.

As we find both Śrīhaṭṭa and Gauḍa in the same locality, that is in the district of Sylhet, we feel no hesitation in identifying this Śrīhaṭṭa with the Śrīhaṭṭa of the traditional account of the Śrī-Gauḍa Brāhmaṇas of Gujarāt, whence they are said to have migrated to Mālava and other provinces. By going from Gauḍa in Śrīhaṭṭa, they probably came to be known as Śrīhaṭṭa-Gauḍa, in contradistinction to the 'Ādi-Gauḍas,' who had already been there. Śrī-Gauḍa seems to be nothing but the shortened form of 'Śrīhaṭṭa-Gauḍa'.

Now let us see if we can find out the time, when these Brāhmaṇas migrated to Mālava. The *Brāhmaṇapattī-mūrti* (p. 433) gives the date of their migration to Gujarāt as 'the Nande Rudra-varṣe,' i. e. in the year 1190. Taking this to be in Vikrama era, it comes to 1137 A. D. So their migration from Bengal to Mālava must have taken place in the tenth or eleventh century at the latest. Epigraphic evidence also goes to support this story of migration of Bengal Brāhmaṇas to Mālava, in the latter part of the tenth century onwards. Mr. K. N. Dikshit exhibited at the 150th Anniversary of Foundation of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, held before year last, certain copper plates found at Gaonry in Narwhal Estate near Ujjain. One set of these copper plates was issued by the Paramāra king Vākpati-Muñja on the 10th of the bright half of the 2nd Aṣāḍha of V. S. 1038 (= 982 A. D.). Some of the donees, says Mr. Dikshit, migrated from 'Kanopā in Magadha, Madhyadeśa, Bilvasavāsa in Dakṣiṇa Rādhā (south-west Bengal) Nandipur (modern Nandur) in south Gujrāt, Pauṇḍarika in the Uttarākula country which may mean the northern bank of the

¹ *Ep. Ind.* Vol. I, p. 172.

² *Ibid.* Vols XII, p. 65 and XIX, pp. 118 and 246.

³ *Castes and Tribes of Bengal*, Vol. II, p. 121.

Ganges, Kauśāmbī, Sāvathika which is apparently the same as Srāvasti and Kolāñca in Bogra district of North Bengal.'¹ Several other inscriptions also testify to the fact of migration of Bengal Brāhmaṇas to Mālava.²

HINDU ALCHEMY AND MODERN CHEMISTRY

(The Origin of gold from Mercury)

BY

J. C. GHOSH

The Alchemists of old claimed the knowledge of transmuting baser metals into gold. But the science of modern chemistry, which is a biproduct of the ancient Alchemy, has so long poohpooed the idea, and called it a dream. Now the Chemists are constrained to admit that this dream of the Alchemists is on the verge of fulfilment. Recently Rao Bhadur Prof. B. Venkatesachar, in the course of his lecture on "The Structure of the Nucleus and the transmutation of Elements", in the Senate House of the Calcutta University, says :—

"The dream of the alchemists was to change baser metal into gold. If we can knock out one proton from the nucleus of the mercury atom we will get the nucleus of gold". (*Statesman*, Saturday, January 5, 1935, p. 5).

¹ Printed *List of Exhibits at the 150th Anniversary of ASB*. We are not in agreement with Mr. Dikshit, in some of his identifications of the villages. As it appears that most of the donees migrated from Eastern India, their former residences must have to be looked for there. If we fail in that, we should try else-where. Madhyadeśa is, in all probability, Madhyadeśa in the Midnapur district. The Brāhmaṇas of this locality are called Madhyasreṇī Brāhmaṇas even today (*Midnapur District Gazetteer*). There is a village named Nandipur, under police station Chintāmon in Dinajpur (*Village Directory, Dinajpur*). Pundari and Pundri are the two villages in the same district (*Ibid*). We know of a village named Pundari in the Rajshahi district, from where some ancient remains have been collected in the Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi.

² *Descriptive Lists of Inscr. in C. P. & Berar*, p. 72, No. 99: *Ep. Ind.* Vol. IX, pp. 108ff.

The knowledge of the Hindus in Alchemy has been traced as early as the *R̥gveda* (*Hist. of Hindu Chemistry*, Vol. I, Intro. p. ii). The use of gold was also known at the period. In the *Atharva-veda*, gold is spoken of as born of fire (*Ibid*, p. VI). Kaṇāda, the author of the Vaiśeṣika system of Philosophy, denies that gold is a substance, although the Mimāṃsakas affirm this to be a peculiar substance. He calls it a mineral light and says that 'some maintain that gold is solid light; or, at least the chief ingredient is light, which is rendered solid by mixture with some particles of earth. He again says that gold is affected by the quality of gravity, by reason of earth contained in it' (*Ibid*, pp. 5 and 7).

Mercury does not appear to have been known so early. Pārada,¹ a name of quick silver, occurs in the *Suśruta*, but Sir P. C. Ray thinks this reference of Mercury, in that work, rather vague (*Ibid*, p. 26). Indubious mention of it is found in the *Vāgbhāṭa* (*Ibid*, p. 31). Regular treatment of mercury is found in works of 800 A. D. and later. From this time it came to be studied extensively. It acquired so much importance that the word *rasa*, in spite of its earlier well-known meaning came to be identified with mercury. *Rasasiddhi* meant 'The knowledge of Alchemy, the possession of peculiar familiarity with mercury obtained by performance of chemical operations, conjoined with certain mystical and magical rites and the securing thence to the adept of happiness, health and wealth, the power of transmuting metals and the art of prolonging life'. (Wilson).

The word *Rasāyana*,² which is now the Sanskrit word for chemistry, used to signify as the science of mercury (*Ibid*, pp. 43-44) at that period. Not only this, from the *Survaḍarsana-saṅgraha* we come to learn that a system of Philosophy named *Rasetvaradaṛsana* grew round it. Mercury was considered as the energy of Śiva or the creative conjunction of Hara and Gauri (*Ibid*, pp. xlii+43).

We have so long seen what the Hindus thought of or did with gold and mercury. We shall now see what some of our scriptures say about them.

¹ Dārda, which is another name of Pārada, occurs in the *Mahābhārata*.

² Alberūṇī connects Patañjali, the author of the Yoga system, with *Rasāyana* (Alberūṇī's *India*—I. p. 80).

The *Rāmāyaṇa* says that the Ākāśa-Gaṅgā (the celestial Ganges) received the semen of Śiva from Agni and conceived thereby. But as she was unable to bear it, under instructions of Agni, threw it on the side of the Himālayas. This womb coming in contact with the different substances of the earth was turned into gold, silver, copper and iron and its impurities into tin and lead (Ādikāṇḍa, Ch. XXXVII).

Again in the *Bhāgavata*, we read, that the river Hāṭakī was formed by the semen of Bhava and Bhavānī (Śiva and his consort) in the Viṭāla. Once upon a time Śiva, finding that Agni (fire), strengthened by Vāyu (air) was drinking this semen, turned it into gold named *Hāṭaka* by *phūlkāra* i. e. the blowing of his mouth (Skandha V. Ch. XXIV, 13-18).

Are all these creations of pure imagination or have they got facts at the base? It is well-worth comparing these with the modern theory of the origin of metals. The account given in the *Bhāgavata* seems to be an allegorical expression describing how gold used to be extracted from some compound of mercury by blasting process.

It has been stated above that pārada (mercury) does not occur in the extant Hindu medical books before the *Suśruta*. This does not prove that mercury was not known to the Indians before that. Varāhamihira (587 A. D.) knew this to be an aphrodisiac (*Bṛhat-Saṃhitā*, Ch. 76). The *Amarakośa* (c. 400 A. D.) mentions pārada as a synonym for mercury. We have seen that mercury occurs in the Ādikāṇḍa or the first book of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, which according to Jacobi is a later addition. Macdonell considers these recent portions to be added not till the 2nd century B. C. and later (*Hist. of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 309). Mercury is chiefly found connected with the Śaiva and Tāntrik cults, which are much older than the second century B. C. So it may not be improbable that the knowledge of mercury in India is as old as those cults.

MAHĀRĀJA RAṆABHAṆJA AND

RĀṆAKA RAṆABHAṆJA

BY

J. C. GHOSH

Some scholars have held that these two princes are identical, but we have already expressed our disagreement with this view. (*J. B. O. R. S.*, Vol. XX. Pt. I. p. 43). There are, no doubt, some points of resemblance between the two, which mark them off as belonging to the same dynasty. But there are sufficient dissimilarities which stand against their identity. They are :—

(1) The charters of the Mahārāja Raṇabhaṇja begin with 'Om (expressed by a symbol) siddhi', whereas those of the Rāṇaka commence with 'Om (also expressed by a symbol) svasti'.

(2) The Mahārāja was a 'Paramamāheśvara', while the Rāṇaka, a 'Paramavaishṇava'.

(3) The Mahārāja was the son of Gandhaṭa, while the Rāṇaka was the son of Śatrubhaṇja and the grandson of Silābhaṇja.

The Mahārāja Raṇabhaṇja ruled in Khiṇjali maṇḍala only whereas the Rāṇaka Raṇabhaṇja and his father Śatrubhaṇja were the lords of Ubhaya-Khiṇjali maṇḍala.

Of these four points of objection, point (3) presents greatest difficulty in identifying the two as one person. In lines 5-6 of the Baud grant of Mahārāja Raṇabhaṇjadeva of the 54th year, we have: — 'Śrī - Gandhaṭa[h]prakaṭa-pauruṣa-raśmi - cakranirddārit - ūri-hṛdayo-sya pitā nṛpaśya 3'. Late R. D. Banerji at first interpreted it as that a king named Gandhaṭa was the king's father. (*E. I.* Vol. XII., pp. 322-23). But subsequently, with a view to identify the Mahārāja with the Rāṇaka, he explained the passage by saying that the Mahārāja Raṇabhaṇja was born in the lineage of Gandhaṭa, (*J. B. O. R. S.*, Vol. XIV., Pt. I. p. 120). If this interpretation is accepted as correct, then the similar expression in line 8 of the Patna Museum grant of Rāṇaka Raṇabhaṇja (*E. I.* Vol. XX. pp. 100 ff.) shall have to be explained in a similar

manner. In that case Śatrubhañja, the father of Rāṇaka Rāṇabhañja, was not the son of Silābhañja, but was only born in his line. But as far as we know, nobody has given this interpretation of the line referred to above. We do not, therefore, see our way to agree with Banerji in his subsequent explanation.

Further, if the two princes are identical, we do not know what satisfactory explanation there can be, for Rāṇaka Rāṇabhañja to make the following changes, as soon as he assumed the title of Mahārāja:—

(1) to begin his charter with 'Om siddhi' and discard 'Om svasti', which he had been so long using.

(2) to change his religion from Vaiṣṇavism to Śaivism.

(3) to cease to name his father and grand father and mention in their places the name of a distant forefather, Gandhata.

(4) to rule over only one Khiñjali maṇḍala, although as a Rāṇaka he was the lord of Ubhaya-khiñjali maṇḍala.

Beside the above, we find that their scribes and engravers were also different. Points (1) and (2) may be explained away, but not (3) and (4). When we notice the consistency with which these differences occur, we cannot brush away lightly their cumulative effect. For these reasons, we are of opinion that they were two different persons. Of the two, we think Mahārāja Rāṇabhañja was the earlier.

NOTES ON INDIAN CHRONOLOGY

BY

P. K. GODE, M. A.

XXXIV

DATE OF VIMALABODHA'S COMMENTARY ON THE MAHĀBHĀRATA CALLED THE VIṢAMAŚLOKĪ-- after 1150 A. D.

Dr. V. S. Sukthankar in his recent article ¹ on the commentators of the *Mahābhārata* states that Arjunamiśra mentions Vimalabodha and Vimalabodha cites Devabodha and hence we get the series : *Devabodha-Vimalabodha-Arjunamiśra*. As the date of Vimalabodha's commentary has not yet been fixed by scholars I propose in this note to analyse a Ms of his commentary called the *Viṣamaślokī* viz. No. 84 of 1869-70 in the Govt. Mss Library at the B. O. R. Institute, Poona, referred to by Dr. Sukthankar in his article mentioned above. This Ms consists of about 88 folios and bears the date Śaka 1724 (= A. D. 1802). It was copied at Poona by one Kṛṣṇabhaṭ Śivarāma Śivanekar from some original, which he complains (in the colophon) was extremely incorrect. Vimalabodha refers to the following authors and works in his commentary :—

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| (1) “ निघंटभाष्यनिरुक्तानि ”—
fol. 1, 85. | (10) आगमे—fol. 3. |
| (2) वैशंपायनटीका—fol. 1. | (11) ब्रह्मांडे—fol. 4. |
| (3) देवस्वामिमत—fol. 1, 12, 15, 23,
24, 31, 54, 59. | (12) भट्टजनमेजयाचार्य—fol. 12, 70, |
| (4) देवबोधपादाः—fol. 2. | (13) वेदनिघंट—fol. 12. |
| (5) मेघातिथिः—fol. 2. | (14) ब्रह्मवेवर्त्ते—fol. 13, 81. |
| (6) निघंटु—fol. 2, 43. निघंट
—fol. 12. | (15) सूत्रकारः—fol. 22. |
| (7) विमलबोधपादायाः—fol. 2. | (16) स्मृतिकारैः—fol. 23, 25. |
| (8) वाराहपुराण—fol. 2. | (17) अथर्वणश्रुतेः—fol. 25. |
| (9) भविष्ये—fol. 3. | (18) षडंगयोग—fol. 25, 81. |
| | (19) कापिलाः—fol. 26. |
| | (20) मंडूकोपाख्याने—fol. 27. |

¹ *Annals*, Vol. XVII, p. 194.

- (21) विक्रमादित्यः—fol. 30.
“आरालिकः सूचनको हस्तिनां दमक-
स्तथा ”
- (21) भोजः — fol. 31 (Gujarati
Press Edition of the
Virāṭaparvan, p. 59
quotes this passage)
- (23) सनत्सुजाते—fol. 48.
(24) श्रुतिः—fol. 47.
(25) पूर्वनिबंधकाङ्क्षिः—fol. 47.
(26) विशालाक्षः—fol. 48.
(27) चाणक्येन—fol. 48.
(28) कलिंगटीकायाम्—fol. 48.
(29) कर्मसमुच्चयपक्ष—fol. 48.
(30) योगसूत्रम्—fol. 52.
(31) पुराणे पंचलक्षणे—fol. 58.
(32) वैशेषिकाः—fol. 59.
(33) मनुना—fol. 61, 63.
(34) नीतिशास्त्रे—fol. 61, 64.
(35) कौटिल्यः —fol. 61, 62.
(36) भोजराजेन व्यवहारमंजयाम्
—fol. 63.
(37) धारंश्वरादीभिः अपि निबंधकैः
—fol. 64.
(38) “ इति महापौराणिकोपाध्यायश्री-
त्रिविक्रमकृतौ महाभारताजिषम-
पद्यतात्पर्यार्थविवरणटीकायाम्
शांतिपर्वणि राजधर्मश्लोकाः
समाप्ताः ”—fol. 65.
- (39) गीतायाम्—66
(40) योगसारे—fol. 67.
(41) सांख्यप्रक्रिया—fol. 67.
(42) कल्पसूत्रे—fol. 67.
(43) कपिलेन—fol. 69.
(44) जनकपंचशिखसंवादे—fol. 70.
(45) सूत्रकृता—fol. 70.
(46) विक्रमाजित (विक्रमादित्यः?)—fol. 70
(47) ब्रह्मपुराणाय—fol. 70.
(48) जमदग्निवचनात्—fol. 71.
(49) सूत्रकृता—fol. 71.
(50) योगशास्त्रे—fol. 71.
(51) छंदोगपरिशिष्टे—fol. 72.
(52) दृष्टिकारेण—fol. 72.
(53) योगशास्त्रविदाम्—fol. 72.
(54) नारदः—fol. 74, 77.
(55) सरस्वतीकंठाभरणे—fol. 74.
(56) जैमिनिना—fol. 74.
(57) नीतिशास्त्रज्ञाः—fol. 76.
(58) शुकेन—fol. 76.
(59) निरुक्त—fol. 78.
(60) “ कांड्यपीयं विद्या उपशुक्तविषना-
शिनी ”—78.
(61) प्रातिशाख्यपञ्जिकायाम्—fol. 78.
(62) आथर्वणी श्रुतिः—fol. 80.
(63) रसायने—fol. 85.
“गंधमादन पार्श्वेया सिद्धजंघुरिति
श्रितः । अमृताख्यं फलं तस्य जरा-
रोगविनाशनं ॥

In the above references the colophon on fol. 65 quoted by me does not appear to have formed part of Vimalabodha's commentary and this conclusion is proved by its absence in another Ms of Vimalabodha's commentary viz. No. 167 of 1887-91 of the Govt. Mss Library, where on folio 49 we have the following brief colophon “एते राजधर्मस्यविषमाः श्लोकाः”. Evidently the colophon on folio 65 of Ms No. 84 of 1869-70, which ascribes definitely the authorship of “महाभारततात्पर्यार्थविवरणटीका” to one त्रिविक्रम (styled as “महापौराणिकोपाध्याय”) is wrongly inserted in the present Ms. Aufrecht in his *Catalogus Catalogorum* does not mention any commentator

of the name त्रिविक्रम as the author of a commentary described in the above-mentioned colophon. In the list of 22 commentators on the *Mahābhārata* given by Dr. Sukthankar in his *Epic Studies*¹ no commentator of the name त्रिविक्रम has been recorded².

We now come to the question of the chronological limits for Vimalabodha's commentary. Dr. Sukthankar has already given us the Series "*Devabodha-Vimalabodha-Arjunamiśra*" which states the relative chronological position of the three commentators. In the list of references recorded above, the references to "धारेश्वर" on folio 64, to "भोजराज" and his "व्यवहारमञ्जरी" on folio 63 and to "सरस्वतीकण्ठाभरण" on folio 74 enable us to fix one terminus to the date of Vimalabodha's commentary. As king Bhoja of Dhārā is assigned to a period-1010 A. D. and 1055 A. D.³ and as A. D. 1062 is considered as a limit for his date⁴ we may not be wrong in fixing about 1150 A. D. as one terminus for the date of Vimalabodha's commentary on the *Mahābhārata*.

XXXV

DATE OF KEDĀRABHAṬṬA'S VṚTTARATNĀKARA

--before A. D. 1000.

In my note on the Date of Kedārabhaṭṭa's *Vṛttaratnākara*,⁵ a popular work on Sanskrit Prosody, I tried to prove that the work was composed before A. D. 1250 in view of its being mentioned in Candūpandita's commentary on the *Naiṣadha-carita* (A. D. 1297). Subsequent to the publication of my note I have come across the following quotations from the work in Aruṇadatta's commentary called *Survaṅghasundarā*⁶ on the *Aṣṭāṅghaṛḍaya* of Vāgbhaṭa II :-

¹ *Annals*, Vol. XVII, p. 185.

² Whether त्रिविक्रम was another name of Vimalabodha in the *gr̥hasthāśrama* (householder's life) is a matter for investigation. We may cite as an analogy the name जनार्दन, which was the name of Ānandajñāna, the author of the *Tarksaṃgraha* (G. O. Series Baroda) in the *gr̥hasthāśrama*.

³ S. K. De; *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Vol. I, p. 147.

⁴ Keith: *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 153, foot-note 2—"Bhoja was alive later than 1060; so also Kalhaṇa vii, 259 treats him as alive in 1062."

⁵ *Annals*, Vol. XVI, pp. 143-144.

⁶ *Aṣṭāṅghaṛḍaya* with the commentaries of Aruṇadatta and Hemādri, ed. by Paradkar Shastri of Akola, N. S. Press, Bombay (forms kindly supplied by the Editor)—pages 235, 236.

Page 235—"मात्रासमकं नवमोत्थान्तम् (मो लगोन्यः)"¹. (दत्तरत्नाकरे अ. २।३२)।

Page 236—"द्रुति विलाम्बिताह नभौ भरो" (दत्तरत्नाकरे² अ. ३।४९).

If the identification of these references as given by the learned shastri is correct we can push back the date of Kedārabhaṭṭa's *Vṛttaratnākara* to 1200 A. D. if not earlier.

According to Dr. Hoernle³ Aruṇadatta flourished about 1220 A. D. and if we presume his reference to the *Vṛttaratnākara* as identified by the editor of the *Sarvāṅgasundarū* commentary as correct we may safely conclude that this work on prosody was composed earlier than 1150 A. D. Prof. Keith⁴ states that the *Vṛttaratnākara* of Kedārabhaṭṭa was composed before 15th century, while according to the evidence recorded in the present and earlier notes of mine it appears that the work must have been composed before 12th century, if not earlier. This work deals with 136 metres and is commented on by not less than 20 commentators as pointed out by me in my previous note on the subject.

Further evidence on the date of the *Vṛttaratnākara* is furnished by the commentary of Somacandra which was composed in Samvat 1329 (= A. D. 1273)⁵ as recorded by the author in a verse at the close of his commentary. The Govt. Mss Library at B. O. R. Institute, Poona possesses a Ms of this commentary (No. 349 of 1884-86) but it does not contain the date of composition found recorded in the Ulwar Ms described by Peterson.

¹ The bracketed variant is found in the Calcutta edition (1915) of the *Vṛttaratnākara* p. 8

² Ibid, p. 14—line 6 is exactly identical with the line quoted by Aruṇadatta.

³ Hoernle : *Osteology*, p. 17 of *Introduction*—The dates of Aruṇadatta and two of his successors as fixed by Dr. Hoernle are :—

(1) Aruṇadatta — about 1220 A. D.

(2) Vijayarakṣita — „ 1240 A. D.

(3) Vācaspati — „ 1260 A. D.

⁴ *History of Sanskrit Literature* (1928) p. 417.

⁵ Vide *Extract 245* in Peterson's *Catalogue of Ulwar Mss* p. 89. Somacandra records the date of his work in the following verse :— " श्रीविक्रमनुषकाले नन्दकृपाटयोनिभूस्संख्ये संवत् १३२९ समजनिरजोत्सवदिने वृत्तिरियंमुग्धबोधकरी ॥ ५ ॥ "

The above date of Somacandra's commentary on the *Vṛttaratnākara* has been included in the *Chronology of Indian Authors* by Nilamani Chakravarti published in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. III (1907), pp. 204-220. This is a supplement to M. Duff's *Chronology of India* and will be found very useful to students interested in Indian Chronology.

Somacandra mentions Hemacandra on folio 17 of the B. O. R. I. Ms referred to above:-- "श्रुतिस्तुखकृदियमपि जगति

निजशिरउपगतवतिसति भवति खज्जा ।

शिखालक्षणे व्यय्यरचिते खज्जा नाम छंदो भवतीति समासार्थः ॥

श्री हेमसूरयस्त्विदं छंदोद्वयं पादचतुष्ककलितं वदति । यथा प्रमृमरमरितरपातिवलतिमिर
निकरमतनुमपियुक्ताणि.....किरणततयइव विदधाति चिरतरमवानिपतितिलक-
तववरविशिखाः ॥ १ ॥ etc. "

It appears from the above extract that Hemasūri or Hemacandra has in one of his works dealt with the two lines of the *Vṛttaratnākara* viz. "श्रुतिस्तुख etc." and "निजशिर etc." as stated by Somacandra. If this statement proves true on identification we may be in a position to push back the date of the *Vṛttaratnākara* before 1000 A. D., for the reason that Hemacandra¹ flourished between 1088-1172 A. D.

Later references to the *Vṛttaratnākara* especially in works, the chronology of which has been settled, will be found useful as they will show the authoritative character of the work. Hemādri, the author of a commentary on the *Raghuvaṃśa*, who is different from his namesake the author of *Āyurvedarasāyana* and *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* quotes, the *Vṛttaratnākara*² while commenting upon *Raghuvaṃśa* VI, 6. I have proved elsewhere³ that Hemādri the author of the *Raghuvaṃśadarpaṇa* flourished in the 1st half of the 15th century. Mr. Nilamaṇi Chakravarti in this *Chronology of Indian Authors*⁴ records the following information about Rāmacandra Bhārati's commentary on the *Vṛttaratnākara* composed in A. D. 1455:--

"A. D. 1455-- One thousand ninehundred and ninety-nine years after the Nirvāṇa of Buddha (according to Ceylonese calculation) Rāmacandra Bhārati composed a commentary on the *Vṛttaratnākara*. The author who was a Bengal Brahmana, went to Ceylon ; converted by Parākrama Vāhu VI (A. D. 1410-1462) and was surnamed Bauddhāgama Cakravartin. He was an adept to the Mahāyāna School, a form of Buddhism, says Prof. Bendal, almost unknown in Ceylon, B. M. C. No. 429."

¹ Keith : *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 464.

² Vide List I, p. 17 of S. P. Pandit's Edn. of the *Raghuvaṃśa*.

³ *Annals*, Vol. XIV, p. 126.

⁴ *Journ. A. S. B.* Vol. III, (1907) p. 208.

REVIEWS

BHĀṬṬĀCINTĀMAṆI of Vāṇcheśvarayajvan, edited by
M. M. Venkatasubrahmanya Shastri, The Madras Law
Journal Press, Madras, 1934, Price Rs. 6/-

The work under review is a commentary on the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* of Khaṇḍadeva. This commentary should be distinguished from other commentaries of the same name on the *Mīmāṃsā Sūtra* viz. (1) by Gaṅgādharaḥṭṭa and (2) by Viśveśvara-ḥṭṭa.¹ Aufrecht does not record any Ms of the *Bhāṭṭa-cintāmaṇi* the work under review, composed by Vāṇcheśvara, though he refers to the other works of this author viz. (1) *Śrauta Sūtra* commentary² (*Hiraṇyakeśisūtravyākhyā*) which he says was " composed about 1800 ". Another commentary on the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* of Khaṇḍadeva was written in 1708 by Śambhubhaṭṭa, a pupil of Khaṇḍadeva³ himself. Khaṇḍadeva also called Śrīdharendra, was the son of Rudradeva. Besides Śambhubhaṭṭa he had another pupil viz. the renowned Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja⁴. In addition to *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* two other works are also ascribed to him viz. (1) *Bhāṭṭarahasya* and (2) *Mīmāṃsākaustubha*. Khaṇḍadeva died at Benares in A. D. 1665.

There is another published commentary on the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* called *Bhāṭṭacandrikā* written by Bhāskararāya. The present commentary by Vāṇcheśvarayajvan though it follows the *Bhāṭṭa-candrikā* of Bhāskararāya in certain respects has still its special features and peculiarities. These have been dealt with by Āryasvāmī in his able Sanskrit Introduction to the work under review (pp. 1-2). Though Vāṇcheśvara's commentary is comparatively modern it serves a very useful purpose by its lucid exposition and vindication of the ancient Mīmāṃsā doctrines. The language of the commentary is as simple as could be used

¹ Aufrecht's *Catalogus Catalogorum*, Part I, p. 404 ; Pt III, p. 88.

² Ibid—Part I, pp. 561, 766.

³ Ibid—Ibid—p. 404.

⁴ Ibid—Ibid—n. 136.

consistently with the demands made on the commentator by the abstract nature of the Mīmāṃsā doctrines and their critical exposition.

The edition of the present commentary was first projected in 1927 and commenced by Mahāmahopādhyāya Venkata Subrahmanya Shastri of Madras. He was eminently fitted for this task by his deep erudition and ability. He had also in his possession the only Ms of the present commentary on which the edition under review is based. Another fortunate circumstance was his ancestral relation to our commentator, he being the son of the daughter of Vāñcheśvara, the author of the *Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi* (vide Genealogy on p. 20 of Introduction). A work so well-circumstanced and enthusiastically projected has had, however, many mishaps. M. M. Venkatasubba Shastri unfortunately died in 1928 and the work of publication came to a stand-still. After sometime His Holiness Śrī Śaṅkarācārya of the Kāmakotipīṭha came to the rescue of this work and appointed Mr. Venkatarama Shastri, the son of the late M. M. Venkatasubba Shastri to see the work through the press. He too unfortunately died after sometime and Messrs Subrahmanya Shastri and Balasubrahmanya Shastri were appointed in his place to carry the work of publication to completion. Naturally, therefore, the printed volume of the present edition though elegant in all other respects contains numerous printing mistakes and an attempt has been made to rectify them in an Errata of 32 pp. annexed to the volume. Another difficulty of the Editor was his necessary reliance on a single Ms of this valuable commentary.

In spite of these blemishes the work has been on the whole carefully done by the Editors and the main credit of bringing to light this elaborate unpublished commentary on Khaṇḍadeva's *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* must be given to H. H. Śrī Jagadguru Śaṅkarācārya of the Kāmakotipīṭha, but for whose sponsorship of this laborious and costly undertaking this commentary would have remained unknown as hitherto.

The Sanskrit Introduction by Āryasvāmī to the present edition is sufficiently critical and historical. Aufrecht states as we have stated above that Vāñcheśvara wrote his *Hiranyakeśi-sūtravyākhyā* about 1800 A. D. On page 331 of the present edition

Vāñcheśvara states—“एवं छंदोगानां स्वसूत्ररीत्या अनुष्ठानमित्यादिकं हिरण्य-
केशिसूत्रव्याख्याने प्रतिपादितमस्माभिः” This reference by our author
to his commentary on the *Hiranyakesisūtra* in the *Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi*
proves, if Aufrecht's statement referred to above is correct, that the
Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi may have been composed after A. D. 1800 or so.
The author of the Introduction states (p. 18) that Vāñcheśvara
wrote other works¹ previous to his writing the *Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi*
in his old age and that he flourished between A. D. 1780 and A. D.
1850 (p. 2). The Genealogy (on p. 20) shows that our author
was descended from Govinda Dikṣita, the well-known minister
of Acyutadevarāya (1529-1542 A. D.).

Vāñcheśvara travelled far and wide from Benares to Rame-
śvaram. This fact is vouched by the following passports in the
possession of his descendants and now published after the Intro-
duction in the volume under review.

Appendix I—Passport No. 292 dated 26th Nov. 1816 signed by
M. Elphinstone, Resident at Poona.

Appendix II—Passport dated 8th October 1818 signed by W.
M. Chaplain, Katoral Palace Agent, Subhā Dharwar etc. •

Appendix III—Passport dated Poona, 25th Sept, 1822, signed
W. M. Chaplain.

Appendix IV—Passport in Kanarese dated 24th January
1824 signed by Krishnarāya Wodiarāvaru of Mysore.

Appendix V—Passport in Persian language, *moḍi* Script and
Kanarese signature, dated 31st Jan. 1824 written by Bukh Row
Munshi, Huzur Darbar, Camp Ramanathapura.

Appendix VI—Letter dated 11th Feb. 1828 to Vedamurty
Kutti Sastry by Shri Krishnaraja Wodaiyar.

¹ In the Introductory verses to the *Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi* Vāñcheśvara states
that he composed the following works—

(1) माहिषशतकव्याख्या, (2) हिरण्यकेशिसूत्रव्याख्या; (3) द्वाचिन्तामणि; (4) आद्वा-
चिन्तामणि; (5) ब्रह्मसूत्रार्थचिन्तामणि; (6) काकनालीयवादार्थ.

The writer of the Introduction adds the following works to the above list
of Vāñcheśvara's works.—

(7) हिरण्यकेशिसामान्यसूत्रव्याख्या; (8) धूर्गानन्दिका; (9) श्लेषार्थचन्द्रिका and (10)
तर्कसंग्रहव्याख्या.

All the above documents refer to Vāñcheśvara's pilgrimage to Rameśvaram and the facilities offered to him by the then authorities for a safe and comfortable journey. The name Kutty Shastri referred to in the above permits was the popular name of Vāñcheśvara.

The present edition contains (1) an elaborate table of contents; (2) an alphabetical index of *adhikaraṇas* dealt with in the *Bhāṭṭa-dīpikā*; (3) an alphabetical index of the *sūtras*; (4) an alphabetical index of *nyāya-adhikaraṇas* and (5) a dictionary of quotations occurring in the *Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi* indicating in some cases their identified sources. All these are useful features of the edition. But for a student of the history of Sanskrit literature not only quotations but even the mere names of authors and works mentioned in this bulky text of 482 pages are important. I have tried to make up this deficiency partially by preparing and appending to this review a list of such references which caught my eye during a cursory perusal of this valuable commentary which I trust would be a rough guide to the historical student.

APPENDIX

Works and Authors mentioned by Vāñcheśvara in his *Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi*

अग्निपुराण-88	उपवर्षः-185
अमर-99, 103, 57, 88	कणादः-177
अष्टकास्मृत्यादिकर्म-70	कमलाकरेण-136
अहोबल-1	कर्कभाष्य-6
आचार्य-378	काकतालीयवादार्थः-2
आचार्यैः-8, 175, 335	काकतालीयवादार्थे (अस्मत्कृत-)-132
आपस्तम्ब-69, 208, 338, 137	काठकादिसमाख्या-89
आपस्तम्बवचन-90	कात्यायन-95, 97, 137
आपस्तम्बहिरण्यकेशिप्रभृतिभिः-196, 198	कात्यायनादयः-69
आश्वलायनः-80	कूर्मवचनात्-4
आश्वलायनीयादयः	कैयट-248
आश्वलायनसूत्र-90	कोशेन-281
आश्वलायनादिसूत्रैः-331,	कौस्तुभ-114, 351, 440
उत्तरमीमांसा-185, 327, 406	कौस्तुभोक्तं-63, 71, 67,
उत्तरमीमांसासूत्रे (भाष्यकारैः)-336	कौषीतकीब्राह्मण-216
उत्तराग्रन्थे-198	खण्डदेव-3

गोपथब्राह्मण-73, 178
 गौतमः-136, 144, 177
 गौतमसूत्र-108
 गौतमस्मृति-91, 284
 गौतमादिधर्मेषु-91
 चन्द्रिका-85
 चाक्रवर्मणादीनाम्-95
 छन्दोगसूत्र-76
 जैमिनी-177
 जैमिनिना छान्दोग्यानुपदग्रथे-73
 तटाकस्मृति-69
 तन्त्ररत्न-115, 225
 ताण्ड्यब्राह्मण-152, 265
 तान्त्रिकाः-52
 त्रिकाण्डीयवचनेन-284
 दत्तचिन्तामणि-2
 दक्षिणादिश्रुती-73
 धर्मशास्त्र-429
 धार्मिक-1
 धातुपाठः-81
 धूर्तस्वामी-189
 न्यायरत्नमाला-8
 न्यायरत्नावल्यां गौडेः-65
 न्यायरत्नाकरे पार्थसारथिमिश्रेः-65
 न्यायसुधा-128, 230, 260, 282, 439
 न्यायसुधाकाराः-124, 249, 41
 निर्णयसिन्धु-85, 136
 निरुक्त-394
 नैयायिकमतम्-353, 369
 पतञ्जलि-95
 पराशरमाधवीय-85
 पाणिनि-33, 177
 पाणिनिसूत्रे-201
 पार्थसारथि-11, 64, 93, 345, 378, 437.
 473, 476, 109, 125
 पार्थसारथिग्रन्थ-333
 पार्थसारथिमतानुयायिनः-174
 प्राचीनव्याख्याकृतः-297
 प्राचीनानुमतः पन्थाः-322

प्राचानः-220
 पुराणादि-403, 404
 बह्वचब्राह्मणे-322
 बादरिमते-336, 341, 343
 बोधायनकल्प-208
 बोधायनादिकल्पे-331
 बोधायनीयाः-244
 बोधायनीयादयः-88
 बोधायनेन-137, 166
 ब्रह्मविन्दूपनिषद्-200
 ब्रह्मसूत्रार्थचिन्तामणि-2
 ब्रह्मसूत्रार्थचिन्तामणौ... अस्माभिः-23
 भगवद्भाष्यकारैः-17, 65, 72
 भगवद्भचन (गीता)-184, 338
 भाट्टचिन्तामणि-2
 भाट्टदीपिका-3
 भाट्टरहस्य-178
 भारती-184
 भाष्य-94, 210, 248, 267
 भाष्यकार-169, 374, 378, 384, 385,
 455, 252, 259
 भाष्यवार्तिकयोः-23
 मण्डनः-41, 137, 175,
 मनु-83
 मनुस्मृति-69
 मन्मतेच-184
 महाभारत-16, 17
 महाभारताख्यायिका-192
 महाभाष्य-8, 51, 21, 98, 103, 104
 मङ्गेशमिश्रोपाध्यायैः-118
 माहिषशतक-1
 माहिषशतकव्याख्या-1
 मिश्राः-41, 287
 मीमांसकमते-369
 मुण्डके-17
 याज्ञवल्क्य-67
 राणककारादयः-84
 राणके-327
 ऋग्वेद (अष्टम अष्टक)-100

वरदराज-127
 वाक्यपदीयकारिका-97
 वार्तिक-285, 399, 406, 414, 425, 436,
 439
 वार्तिककार-84, 94, 99, 109, 144, 374,
 376, 386
 वार्तिकन्यायसुधा-75
 वार्तिकसूत्र-29, 39, 45
 वार्तिके-277, 278
 वार्तिककृत-372
 विचारण्यश्रीचरणाः (वेदभाष्ये)
 वेदभाष्य-49, 136, 300, 394
 वेष्टनस्युते-79
 वैद्यशास्त्रानुसारेण-412
 वैशेषिकसूत्र-437
 वृद्धमनुस्मृति-68
 शतरुद्रीयान्तिममन्त्रे-208
 शब्दकौस्तुभ-97
 शाकल-बाष्कल-तैत्तिरीयादिसमाख्या
 परिग्रह-33
 शाक्यादिरस्युति, शाक्यग्रन्थ-75, 78
 शातातपस्युति-83
 शास्त्रदीपिका-115

शास्त्रदीपिकायां (आग्नेयाधिकरणे)-224
 शिक्षावचनेन-26
 आद्यचिन्तामणि-2
 श्रीनिवासार्थ-1
 श्रौतसूत्रकारीय (व्यवहार)-121
 संकर्षभाष्य-135
 संकर्षभाष्ये (पितृयज्ञाधिकरणे)
 सामवेदे ऊहाख्य ग्रन्थविशेष-32
 सामवेदिकोत्तराग्रन्थे-192
 सांख्यसूत्रेण-18
 सूत्रकार-90, 94
 सूत्रभाष्य-394, 446
 सूत्रभाष्यवार्तिकवेदभाष्यरीत्या-137
 सूत्रामण्याम्-136
 स्कान्दे-2
 हरि-97
 हरिणा-82, 95
 हरिश्चन्द्रोपाख्यानादीनां क्षेमेन्द्रादिनिर्मिता-
 ख्यायिकानां-38
 हलायुध-189
 हिरण्यकेशिसूत्रव्याख्या-1
 हिरण्यकेशिसूत्रव्याख्याने अस्माभिः-13,
 37, 76, 138, 196, 228, 331

P. K. Gode.

THE MYSTERY OF THE MAHĀBHĀRĀTA, VOLS. I-V,
by Prof. N. V. Thadani, M. A., price Rs. 44/-, Bharat Publ.
House, Karachi

This large work covering more than 2000 pages, has now been finished, and the learned author who has been busy with this task for more than 12 years past, deserves to be congratulated upon his patience and perseverance, which alone, combined naturally with a sincere enthusiasm, could have led to the accomplishment of the "mystery".

As we had already expressed, while reviewing, in these pages, the first volume of this work, it is one thing to conceive an idea, and altogether another to exert the necessary patience to work out the same. Every man, according to a well known maxim, is a poet; but it is given to only a few to bring their heart's poetry into concrete form, and of fewer still, to do the work beautifully.

Leaving aside casual readers who only read for diversion, and others who read it as a sacred rite which fetches some 'punya', any student who carefully reads a number of chapters in the Great Epic, is struck by a sort of looseness of construction all-through. There are many contradictions, repetitions, parallelisms etc. in the body of the Epic, and for nearly a century past scholars are busy studying the different problems, connected with the Great Epic, each scholar trying in his own way to find some reasonable solution thereto.

And here is a large work of the nature; this has engaged Prof. Thadani for 12 years, and one really admires the patience with which the learned author has stuck to his laborious task. Five bulky volumes of a considerable size, covering more than 2000 pages, is not the work which can be turned out of an ordinary brain. And one's regard for the author rises still higher, when one sees that the subject, too, is not such an attractive one.

But the idea of this great work attracted Prof. Thadani, and we have the result before us. And what would be our judgment when we glance at the contents, and with patience equal to that of the author, set ourselves to studying the whole 'Mystery'?

In order to justify his own remarks, it is now the unfortunate task of the reviewer to lay before the readers, at least a brief outline of the work he reviews. Of course, if it is a really sweet work the reviewer is blessed by the reader for supplying the contents, but the present is a different case, and hence this apology :

‘The Great Epic’ in the opinion of the learned author, ‘is not a mere story of great deeds of mythological heroes and gods, but a wonderful explanation of all systems of Hindu Philosophy and Religion, written in a story form which, when examined in the light of ancient method of *Letter-analysis*, reveals the great secret of its real meaning and mystery’.

This idea of *Letter-analysis* has been most patiently worked out in all the five Volumes before us. The First Volume shows how the Sacred Books of the Hindus, from the Vedas to the Epics, deal with the science and philosophy of life-evolving from the organic Cell into Brahmāṇḍa or the whole Universe—and concludes with an explanation of the Hymns and Gods of the Vedas in this light.

Second Volume examines the great systems of Hindu Philosophy and Religion, and shows how they are all based on the Vedas, and connected with one another.

In the Third Volume we have a detailed account of the story of the Epic, divided into 372 sections and a brief explanation of the *essential idea* of the whole as a picture of all the systems. The Fourth and Fifth Volumes contain a detailed explanation of the whole story of the Great Epic, and show that it is a picture of the contest between the different Systems of Philosophy, in the light of the ancient method(?) of *Letter-analysis*.

The reader is, all through the extensive work, faced with the mystery of this so called ancient method of *Letter-analysis*. It would have been well if the author had quoted the original source of this method ; but such being not the case, the mere perusal of the table at p. 323ff of Vol. III is not at all convincing and satisfactory. The learned author has also, at the beginning of the Fourth Volume, given a long list of the characters in the Epic with the corresponding ideas which, in the opinion of the author, they personify.

Going a little further, into the heart of this laborious work, we have, at Vol. III, p. 316 : " The whole story of the Mahābhārata is but an account of the connection and conflict between the different systems of Hindu Philosophy and Religion ". So that really speaking, there is no history, no war and no death ! What is war is only a *debate* where each side starting from some common point of agreement, marshalls its array of arguments. " Of these," to quote the author again, " the most interesting as well as the most comprehensive conflict is between principal Vedānta and principal Sāṃkhya or Vaiṣṇavism on the one hand, and Buddhism and Jainism on the other-and that is the subject matter of the great " battle ". of Kurukṣetra ! "

Now, we shall quote a few stray instances, picked up at random, to show how Prof. Thadani, explains the story in his own way.

"The word for Gambling in the text is Dyūta (d, y, ū, ta,) meaning, (d) giving, (y) Buddhi, (ū) woven with (u) the senses of knowledge, and (ta) the senses of Action. " The Gambling match is thus a discussion between Buddhi on the one hand (Yūdhishthira), and the senses of knowledge and Action, the basis of Jainism (Śakuni) on the other "

In Vol. III of the work, we have an English translation, in verse, of all the eighteen chapters of the Lord's Song, Bhagavad-gītā ; while the situation is explained, in Vol. IV. (pp. 463ff.), as follows. " The Battle of Kurukṣetra is a " conflict " of systems of thought. Man is first represented as unable to accept the the Yoga system of thought, where Yoga is identified for practical purposes with Vedānta, as Buddhi, the basis of Yoga, is identified with the soul, the basis of Vedānta. This gives us Yoga-Vedānta, Viśiṣṭādvaita, or qualified Monism, the creed of the Man, while his opponents are wedded to Buddhism and Jainism. "

" The Nature of the combat-we have explained that the general " combat " between the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas is between Vaiṣṇavism (Vedānta-Yoga-Vaiśeṣika) on the one hand and Buddhism and Jainism (Sāṃkhya-Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika) on the other. The two sides meet, however nominally on the common ground

of Vaiśeṣika based on the character of the Mind, holding that Puruṣa and Prakṛti are joint and equal or almost equal partners in the creation of life. Starting from this, the Pāṇḍavas have to prove that it is god alone who creates, and Prakṛti, if it is a separate entity is but a spectator of this work. "

It is really wonderful. Prof. Thadani has, with exceptional patience, worked out even all the minor details of his theory, although, in the elaborate Volumes, one often comes across tedious repetitions, the only point—and this is really the important point at issue,—is how far the reader can be convinced by all his laborious argument in favour of the allegorical nature of the Great Epic.

That the Mahābhārata is an 'Itihāsa'—of course Prof. Thadani's Letter—analysis is sure to interpret this word in quite another way. But, as it is at present understood, by all—a 'history' and not a myth or allegory, is recorded in the very text of the Epic, in numerous places: 'Itihāsottamād asmāt'; 'jayo nāmetihāso yam', etc. etc. That the Pāṇḍavas, Kauravas, Kṛṣṇa, in fact, all the characters connected with the story were living persons; they moved, they fought, and they died, is the idea which holds us to the end, as we read the Great Epic; and we exult, cry, and weep with them, owing to the deep interest that is aroused in our heart.

And now comes Prof. Thadani with his thesis and asks us to consider the whole as nothing more than a deliberate attempt to put the contest of all the systems of thought into an allegorical form! And judging from our ideas which have been deep-rooted in our heart, for centuries, we would not be surprised if this learned author, after all his labours, finds them wasted for want of any followers.

And still, one cannot but admire the Professor's enthusiasm, which carried him to the end of his self-imposed task!

S. N. Tadpatrikar.

**BHARATĪYA ANUŚĪLANA, publ. Hindi Sahitya Sammelana,
Allahabad, Sam. 1990**

This Commemoration Volume prepared in honour of and dedicated to Mm. Pandit Gauri Shankar Ojha, the Vetaran Indian Scholar, on the attainment of his 71st year, contains, as usual, numerous articles from the pen of scholars of repute, and deals with different topics of Ancient Indian interest. The fact that many ruling princes of Northern India, have made liberal donations to cover the cost of printing the Volume, shows the great respect that this venerable scholar commands even among the aristocratic circle.

A special feature of this Volume is that, excepting those in English, all the articles written in the different vernaculars of India, are printed in Devanāgarī type; while to each article is attached a short Summary in Hindi.

The Volume has been divided into 10 different sections, and the list of scholars who have written articles for this Volume covers not only the whole of India, but also includes some European scholars of high reputation. Among latter, to mention only a few, are Prof. A. B. Keith, Otto Strauss, Przłuski, Konow, Glassennop, Norman Brown etc.

Looking closely into this vast field, we have before us, a rich harvest of the different important crops, in different places. It is not, however, possible to take a complete survey of *all* the articles in this large volume. With apologies therefore, to the learned writers, whose writings have not been noticed here, the following is a running summary of some of the articles that would interst even a general reader.—

Prof. Keith has, in his article on the Indus valley civilization arrived at the negative conclusion that it is not that of the Rgveda; while in his Hindi article, Prof. S. K. Chatterji. has taken a review of the Ancient Indian Culture, and having mentioned the different influences to which it was subjected, has, turn-

ing to the Epics, finally remarked that the Great Epic Mahābhārata in its present encyclopaedic form, was established some time about the beginning of the christian era.

Prof. Sten Konow's notes on Takṣaśilā, as well as Mr. Jayaswal's article on Āryamañjuśrīmūla Kalpa are also of considerable interest, the latter especially so, as the writer has culled out a history of the Mauryan period from this Bhuddhistic work.

Prof. Altekar has thrown some new light on the Rāstrakūṭas of Gujarath, while the articles on Poet Dhoyi, author of Pavana-dūta, Karna, Solanki king, the Jain king Kumārapāla have a historical interest. Mr. Bahadurchandra Sastri of Leiden university, gives an account of the Hindu literature in Java; Mr. Acharya of Mayurbhanj writes about some rulers of Orissa in the Mediaeval Period.

Turning to the period of Modern History, Mr. Bendre of Poona in his Marathi article, describes the last battle of Vijaynagar. Then we have some side light on the history of the Maratha movements in Rajaputana, where the writer Mr. Bhalerao, pleads for more research work in the line. A military History of India from Ancient times is given in a brief outline by general Shinde of Baroda; here we see how the art of warfare developed among the Indians.

Diwanbahadur Sarda gives in an interesting article, a brief history of the research work mainly bearing on Rajaputana done by scholars of the 19th century.

Passing over some articles of Epigraphic interests, we come to Indian Art, where Mr. Ramachandran gives us some interesting details of Pallava Paintings.

An English article treating of some Tibetan customs, by the late Sir J. J. Modi of Bombay, takes us to another, treating of 'Kṣatriyas in Greater India' where Dr. V. Chatterji, gives us a peep into the history of Indian exploits in the Far East. Rai-bahadur Hiralal brings us back to Central India and C. P., and shows how Rajputs settled in this part, are connected with their original clans.

It is interesting to note that Sjt. Rameshvarji son of Pandit Ojha, contributes an article on the Boar incarnation of Viṣṇu. The article gives a comparative study of all the Pauranic sources and it is illustrated by Photos of some of the old images of the Varāha. And speaking of the Purāṇas, we have another interesting article from the pen of Mr. Jayachandra Vidyalaṅkāra, one of editors of this Volume. This article deals with the Rājasūya expedition of the Pāṇḍavas, and throws important historical light on some of the places into the west enumerated in Nakula's expedition as described in the Sabhāparva of the Mahābhārata. Mr. Narang has, here, suggested some intelligent emendations and also shown his critical views regarding the identification of these places.

In the end, we wish long life to Pandit Ojha, who commands such high respect among all Sanskritists, and with repeated apologies to the scholars, whose names and writings, have through oversight, been omitted in this short review, we conclude.

S. N. Tadpatrikar.

EVOLUTION OF HINDU MORAL IDEALS by Sir S. P.
Sivaswami Aiyer, K. C. S. I., C. I. E., LL. D., Calcutta
University, (1935) ; pp. XIX + 230 + 12.

It is well-known that the late Sir Ashutosh Mukarjee had been an exemplar to the the Vice-Chancellors of the other Indian Universities by founding the Research Department of the Calcutta University. It is not however equally known that he had also been an exemplar to the well-to-do from amongst the living fathers of children by founding in 1924 a lectureship at the Calcutta University in loving memory of his beloved daughter Kamalā, for an annual delivery of a course of three lectures in English or Bengali on some aspect of Indian life and thought to be treated from a comparative standpoint and by providing the University with the wherewithals to remunerate the lecturer liberally and publish the lectures, by handing over G. P. Notes of a fairly large amount. The choice of the Senate of that University having once fallen on Sir S. P. Sivaswami Aiyer and he having been left free to select any subject falling within the terms of the endowment, selected the subject which forms the title of the book under review.

The learned author has made it clear in the preface that the said subject had suggested itself to him by the recent organized attempts of orthodox Hindus to oppose the introduction of social reform in Hindu Society by legislative enactments and that his object was to convince the educated Indians that the ethical ideals of the Hindus have not remained the same since the earliest time of which we have a literary record but have continued to undergo changes from time to time according to the requirements of each age and that therefore it would be no sacrilege to mould our ethical ideals so as to suit the modern conditions. With that end in view he has examined the views of the Hindu law-givers on several topics of ethical interest such as woman, slavery, caste, law and justice &c. and appraised them in the light of the modern notions on those topics, in the first nine chapters following the Introductory. While doing so he has

given comparative notes based on the works of European writers on morals such as Leckey, author of the *History of European Morals*, Westermarck, author of the *Origin and Developement of the Moral Ideals*, Hobhouse, author of *Morals in Evolution* and others, with a view to enable the readers to take into consideration the ideas and customs of other nations on the same topic before passing judgments on those of the Hindus.

His other declared object in selecting this subject was to consider the validity or otherwise of the criticisms of the principles of the Hindu religion made by some Christian missionaries in order to show to the world how ill-informed, unfair and biassed they were. This he has done in Chapter XI of the work. He has also considered therein the question whether the influence of the Hindu religious principles has been deleterious to the ethical and social progress of Hindu India.

Chapter XII has been devoted to an investigation of the question whether the changes that have already taken place in the ethical conception of the educated Hindus of both the sexes are desirable or undesirable. In the thirteenth and the last chapter the author has expressed his views as to the trend of modern thought on ethical subjects and considered how far the unhealthy tendencies that have crept in are capable of being checked and ought to be checked in order that the foundations of Hindu society may not be shaken and uprooted though its structure may be re re-modelled and re-constructed so as to suit the changed outlook on life brought on by the spread of Western education and culture and by an increase in the intensity of the struggle for existence.

This book thus serves a triple purpose, (1) that of trying to persuade the orthodox Hindus to agree to the introduction of certain reforms which the spirit of the present age have made inevitable and which are not inconsistent with the Scriptures; (2) that of defending the fundamental principles of the Hindu religion against the attacks of prejudiced and interested critics and (3) that of warning the radical reformers of both the sexes against the danger of blindly following the Western nations wherever they go and of impressing upon them the necessity of drawing a line up to which it would be safe to go if the integrity of the Hindu

character of our society is to be preserved. His criticism is well-founded and sympathetic, his defence well-documented and vigorous and his warning well-thought out and friendly. There is no invective in his criticism, no partiality in his defence and no imperiousness in his warning.

There are however two drawbacks therein which I cannot refrain from taking a note of. The first is that no attempt has been made by the learned author to determine what is the scope of the science of ethics, whether morality is an end in itself or a means to an end, what are virtues and what are vices, whether there is anything like an absolute moral standard by which the actions of everybody, whether in private or public life, should be judged and if so, what it is and if not, what should be the standards by which private conduct and public conduct ought to be judged. If the examination of the ethical notions of the Hindus had been commenced after doing that, I believe the work would have proved more useful. Another drawback that I have noticed in this work is the lack of any scientific arrangement of the different topics of ethical interest with reference to which the evolution of the Hindu ideals have been traced. The learned author has admitted in the preface that he has not attempted any classification of the topics and his excuse for not doing so is that whatever principle of classification is adopted, the classes would be found to be overlapping. In my view that excuse is not convincing.

Yet so far as it goes, the work is sure to commend itself to the educated Indians for whose edification it has been written and to prove an eye-opener to them with respect to several topics of interest about which they carry wrong notions imbibed in the college class-rooms and on playgrounds. For those who wish to study the subject seriously the author has taken pains to prepare and append an exhaustive index. The printing and get up of the work are also such as to attract readers towards it.

P. C. Divanji.

EARLY HISTORY OF KAUSĀMBĪ by Nagendranath Ghosh
with an introduction by Radhakumud Mookerji ; Allahabad Archaeological Series, No. 1, Allahabad, 1935. Pp. XXXV+120. Price, Rs. 4/-.

This book is a praiseworthy attempt to collect in a single volume all known information about the city of Kausāmbī before the Mughal period. The author is a typical exponent of that renascent enthusiasm for antiquity which has found an important practical outlet in the activities of the Allahabad Archaeological Society, of which the author is (according to the title-page) an Honorary Life Member.

The book opens with a discussion of the oldest known references to the city of Kausāmbī, of which that in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa seems more valuable than any in the Purāṇic tradition. But these, after all, are vague. The fullest body of evidence adduced belongs to the Buddhistic period and to the days of Mauryan rule. At this stage, something more is known of the people associated with the city than mere names, and the author closes the *Early History* proper at the reign of Udayana. The rest of the book consists of three appendices, rather curiously divided. The most important single report is that in Appendix II, on an image of Buddha of the second year of Kanīṣka's rule. Appendix I is a reasonably full and critical account of the data available to the author from Udayana to Bahasatimita. The book is decently printed, and supplied with some moderately good plates as well as a very convenient Index.

With all due praise for a first attempt, it must be confessed that the work in question leaves a great deal to be desired. The striking part about the whole discussion is the paucity of material to which any credence can be given by the historian. From the pioneer view-point of a Vincent Smith, in the much larger framework of a general history of India, even fabulous references have some worth. But the evidence of a book like the Kathāsaritsāgara, mentioned in the introduction as well as the text, has about as much value as that of the Arabian Nights for a critical

history of the caliphate of Harounal Rashid. The Jātaka stories are not much better, and an *Atthakathā* written eight centuries after the period by a monk in Ceylon who shows no acquaintance with northern India can, at best, be mentioned in passing. For all this, it might be possible to excuse the author and the learned prefator; but both have neglected the most important new source available to them, the Jain tradition. The sole religious building of any importance that survives on the ruins of a far vaster edifice at Kosam is Jain, the temples at Pabhosā are Jain; the images, which lay scattered in 1930 on the path from the Aśoka pillar to the riverside—perhaps a by-product of Dayaram Sahni's work in excavating the base and restoring the pillar—and which (according to pages 110–111) now grace the Allahabad Museum are mostly Jain. But to one who relies on the present work alone for his knowledge, there is not even a suspicion of the existence of a large ardhamāgadhī tradition in which many interesting details about the venerable city could be found.

The book and, for that matter, all the activities of the Society call for a word of warning. No history of Kauśāmbī is possible without excavation. And as yet, not even the surface has been scratched. The ruins have raised the ground level for about three square miles to very nearly the height of the pillar there, but the indigent farmer still ploughs over the mixture of dust and brick-bats in the hope of a precarious crop. The legend that an unexpectedly classical if unerudite tenant relates even now of a spot where the relics of Janamejaya's (*sic*) *yajña* may be found indicates some holocaust from which that portion of the ancient city never recovered. The dry water-courses which lead to the river are undoubtedly old streets, as seen from the remains of brick walls down to the very bottom. When the Allahabad amateurs begin to drive their trenches across these gigantic ruins, let them not, in the excitement of a first discovery, obscure or damage evidence that will be of great value to the expert. That they themselves, even with the very best of intentions, still lack something of the expert touch is evidenced by the publication of the present book which, however, is quite suitable for newspaper articles. The present reviewer photographed (*in situ*) the companion inscription to that referred to on p. 110, but

six years have elapsed without the Allahabad people reaching anything like a satisfactory reading, or even one which scholars who have seen the photographs think plausible. Again, the large bricks referred to on p. 103 as presumably ancient are either paving bricks, or bond bricks used, even after the Guptas, for the string courses necessary in buildings erected without good foundation in alluvial soil. The conjecture on p. 106 about the Aśoka pillar is incomprehensible, and could be decided at once by a word from Dayaram Sahni as to the precise extent of his spade-work.

Kausāmbi has yet to find its Gregorovius and its Giacomo Boni.

K.

